

This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

WORKS PUBLISHED BY

PARTRIDGE AND OAKEY.

I.

The Imprisonment and Deliverance of Dr. Achilli, with some account of his previous History and Labours: to which are added, his Three Letters to Gregory XVI. and Pius IX. By Sir C. E. EARDLEY, Bart., Author of "Romanism in Italy," &c. 8vo. 3s. 6d.

II.

Analysis of the Evidence given before the Select Committees upon the Slave Question. By a BARRISTER. Demy 8vo. price 2s. 6d.

III.

Real Religion; or, the Practical Application of Holy Scripture to the Daily Walk of Life. By the Authoress of "The Pearl of Days." Royal 18mo. cloth, with Two Wood Engravings, 2s.

IV.

Explanatory Notes and Comments on the New Testament. By EDWARD ASH, M.D. Three vols. crown 8vo. 21s.

"A very solid and meritorious production, with the rare merit of saying much in the least possible compass. We decidedly prefer it to the volume of Barnes on the same important department of Revelation."—UNITED PRESB. MAG.

V.

A Chronological and Historical Atlas of the Middle Ages, compiled for the Use of Schools. By Prof. G. MASSON, B.A., Univ. Gallic. Folio, cloth, 12s.

VI.

A Mission to the Mysore: with Scenes and Facts illustrative of India, its People, and its Religion. By W. ARTHUR, Wesleyan Minister. Second Thousand. Fcap. 8vo. cloth, 7s.

"Macaulay himself never wrote a chapter more worthy of a Christian statesman's perusal than is the seventh chapter of this volume, entitled 'India, what is it?'"—BENTLEY'S MIS.

VII.

A Narrative of the Wesleyan Mission to Jamaica, with Occasional Remarks on the State of Society in that Colony. By the Rev. PETER DUNCAN, formerly a Missionary in that Island. Crown 8vo. cloth, 7s. 6d.

"A tale which opens before us the progress of one of the most notable triumphs of the work of God."—CHRIS. MISCELLANY.

VIII.

Helen; or, the Infant Prisoner of War: a Narrative. By ANNA MARIA. Fcap. 8vo. 2s. 6d.: crimson 3s.

"As a present for youth, its claims are second to none of its class."—CHRISTIAN TIMES.

IX.

The Cossacks of the Ukraine; containing Biographical Notices of Mazeppa, Sava, Zelesniak, Gonta; a Memoir of Princess Tarakanof; particulars respecting Catherine II. of Russia, and her Favourites, &c. By COUNT HENRY KRASINSKY, Author of "The Poles in the Seventeenth Century," &c. Cloth 10s. 6d.

"A work of a most singular and interesting character."—HERALD.

THE JESUITS,

THEIR

RISE AND PROGRESS, DOCTRINES, AND MORALITY;

WITH NUMEROUS

EXTRACTS FROM THEIR OWN WRITERS.

BY

T. H. USBORNE, ESQ.,

Author of 'The Magician Priest of Avignon; or, Popery in the Thirteenth Century;'
'A New Guide to the Levant, Syria, Egypt, &c.;'
'Scenes and Sketches in Spain and Portugal;'
'Tales of the Braganza;' &c.



LONDON:
PARTRIDGE AND OAKEY, PATERNOSTER ROW;
AND 70, EDGWARE ROAD (HANBURY AND CO., AGENTS).

1851.

110. d. 353.

LONDON:
GEORGE WOODFALL AND SON,
ANGEL COURT, SKINNER STREET.

CONTENTS.

Page

Rise and Progress of the Jesuits 5

DOCTRINES AND MORALITY OF THE JESUITS.

On the Knowledge of God 37
Sins of Ignorance 39
On Servile Fear 43
On Loving God 43
On the Worship due to God 55
On Absolution of Sins 60
On loving our Neighbour, and our duty towards him . 71
On the Nature of Oaths 83
On Sensuality 89
On assisting others in practices of Debauchery, &c. . 93
On the Vanity of Women, and their love of Finery . 96
On Gluttony and Drunkenness 99
On the Murder of Kings 102
The Oath of Secrecy of the Jesuits 107
A Short Notice of Jesuits' Works on Auricular Confession 109
On the Practice, Working, and Morality of Auricular Confession 118


600092049U

RISE AND PROGRESS

OF

THE JESUITS.

WHAT is Christianity? and why is that religion which Christ himself taught us, "Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good-will towards men," now torn and divided into so many furious sects and hostile parties? is a question that may well be asked and as readily answered. We are more fond of theology than of God. We are too prone to regard the authority of man rather than *His Revealed Will.* If in everything connected with religion we were strictly to confine ourselves to the study of the Bible, no differences of opinion could then exist between us—at least, if to that study we joined a humble and prayerful spirit; for that sacred volume, perused with any other feeling, is to us, as to the Jews of old, "a stumbling-block, and unto the Greeks foolishness."

The whole doctrine of vital Christianity may be comprised in two parts: the one which teaches us

what we are to believe; the other, *how we ought to live.* The standard and rule of both are the *Old* and *New* Testaments.

Provision was early made by the Apostles and their disciples that these books should be read in the assemblies of the first Christians, to enlighten their minds with truth and to advance them in all piety. The manner of teaching these religious truths was at first perfectly simple. They had no thought or wish to recommend them by ingenious explanations and philosophical arrangements.

These Christian associations were scarcely organized before many of the early converts, little contented with the simplicity and purity of that religion which the Apostles taught, attempted innovations, wanting, in fact, to fashion out a religion for themselves, as we learn from various passages in the Epistles of St. Paul.

After the death of the first Apostles and followers of our Saviour, these gradually acquired influence, laying the foundations of those sects which gave rise to so many contests in the Christian community. The system of morals of the sects widely differed. Some recommended abstinence, and austerity, and bodily mortifications, in order that the soul might enjoy greater liberty. While others, on the contrary, maintained that men might safely indulge in libidinous desires, and that there was no moral difference in human actions. Both of these extreme opinions

derived their origin from Eastern philosophy—from the Ascetics and Epicureans, who grafted their ideas upon a Christian stock.

To the common people the truths of Christianity were for some centuries explained in their purity and simplicity, nor were their minds overloaded by a multitude of precepts or subtleties of distinction. But in their schools and books, the higher class, who cultivated philosophy and literature, especially those of Egypt, were too fond of subjecting divine wisdom to the light of reason and to the precepts of philosophy. At the head of this class was Origen, who endeavoured to determine the causes and grounds of every doctrine of religion by the rules and precepts of Platonic philosophy. Though for the most part he proceeded with carefulness, yet his example led his disciples to burst the barriers he had prescribed, and to explain divine truths by the somewhat licentious dictates of philosophy. To these divines we owe that species of *theology* called scholastic, in which theology, in after years, the religious orders, and especially the Jesuits, so pre-eminently excelled. Origen was one of the first of those interpreters of the Bible who found in its writings a secure retreat for errors and idle fancies of all kinds. He taught that the words in many portions of the Scriptures convey no meaning at all; or a hidden sense, altogether different to their natural import, and far preferable

to it. Origen, therefore, may be called the first stepping-stone to that specious and dangerous interpretation of the Bible of which, in long-after years, the Jesuits, with the full approbation of the Romish Pontiffs, and with, at least, the tacit concurrence of all the other orders of the Romish Church, so successfully availed themselves to the full—to mystify what was simple, to debase what was pure.

The limits of this work will not permit our giving the sad history of the gradual corruption of morals of the teachers and ministers of Christianity, from the time of Origen to that of the various Pontiffs who filled the Papal throne up to the period of the pontificate of Paul III. Hundreds of volumes might indeed be written, as hundreds of volumes are still existing, recording in their dark pages the dreadful state of secret vice, of open profligacy and crime, in which the Christian world was plunged under the teaching and example of the priests of Rome. From time to time numerous reformers of the abuses of Papacy had indeed risen up to keep alive the light of divine knowledge and scriptural truths, as in Avignon, in Bohemia, in the Netherlands, and in England; but these were mostly crushed and exterminated by the destruction of the towns and villages where these opinions were prevalent, by the slaughter of whole populations, and by laying waste the country with fire and sword. But the suppression of the

truth by this means was no longer practicable after the appearance of Martin Luther, when the Scriptures, by the instrumentality of printing, were generally made known and diffused through all nations. The age of crusades had long since passed away, and Papal Rome was no longer able to subdue heresy by that means; and the power of the church could now only be preserved by policy and by art against the overwhelming force of public opinion.

It was at this period, when the very heart of the Papacy was faint with terror and alarm at the giant strides which the Reformation, under Luther, was making over the whole of Christian Europe, that a fanatic, more wildly and fearfully mad than either the profligate St. Dominic, or the drivelling pedlar of Assis, whom Romanists have styled St. Francis, made his appearance at Rome. The object of his visit was to gain a recognition of that order—the Society of Jesus—which the Pope, on his part, was no less anxious to grant and to see established. The founder of this order was a Spanish knight, called Don Inigo de Guipascoa, better known to history as the infamous Ignatius Loyola: "L'homme idiote et sans lettres, et qui n'avoit connoissance d'autre mestier que des armes," as his eulogist, D'Oultreman, informs us*. The details of the life of this fanatic are made up of fastings, watchings, whippings, and a repetition

* *Tableau des Personnages Signales de la Compagnie de Jesus*, p. 7.

of long Latin prayers (the meaning of which last he was ignorant of), that form the staple article in the lives of all Roman Catholic saints. After a pilgrimage bare-footed to Jerusalem, during which he neither washed, nor shaved, nor trimmed his hair; alive with vermin, and a mass of human filth, that even the beggars were compelled to leave the ward in which he sojourned; after nearly murdering a Morisco merchant, in token of his conversion; after having been publicly flogged, at his own desire, for his stupidity, when upwards of thirty, at two grammar schools at Barcelona and Montmartre, where he sat on the same form with little boys less than one-third of his age, he acquired a slight and imperfect knowledge of French and Latin: with these acquirements, and with a stock of the most superstitious credulity and blood-thirsty bigotry, unsurpassed, perhaps, in the annals of the world, he started for Rome, to complete his task of reforming Christianity by becoming the founder of Jesuitism.

The reception he met with at Rome was gratifying beyond all that his most sanguine expectations had dared to anticipate. The whole Papal court combined to show him kindness; contriving their expressions of favour with admirable dexterity, so as at once to flatter his vanity and to humour his fanaticism. The effect of all these flatteries had been accurately calculated beforehand. The extravagantly

exalted notion of the Papal supremacy, which was the prominent feature in the madness of Ignatius, was still further exaggerated, if that was possible. Submission to the Pope became thenceforward the one end of his life, and to promote it the one object of his projected Society.

The bull which established this new order bestowed abundant praise upon Ignatius, adopted the whole of his suggestions, without one alteration, and created him Grand Master, or General of the Company of Jesus. In plain indication, also, of the Pope's designs, it selected for special commendation that clause of the vow on admission which bound the members to *uncontrolled obedience to the will of the Pope*, as eminently calculated to promote humility, the destruction of the body of sin, and the total subjection of the will. Moreover the bull hinted pretty openly at the great extent and delicate nature of the services to be performed by them; and enlarged upon the necessity which would be imposed upon every member of the order not to express or even to harbour a wish, or an opinion, as to the particular mission to which he may be appointed, but to *leave everything to God, the Pope, and his superior**.

It had long been the policy of the Romish pontiffs to control, to defend, and to enlarge their empire, by

* *Bulla Regimini militantes Ecclesiæ; in magno Bullario Romano*, tom. i., pp. 778 seq.

means of the religious orders, whom interest joined more closely to them than the regular clergy; it therefore became necessary, after the unsuccessful contest with Luther, that some new society, free from the open vices and profligacy which disgraced the old ones, should be established, wholly devoted to the interests of Rome, to enable them *to recover, if possible, what was lost*, and to fortify and guard what still remained entire.

The Dominicans and Franciscans, by which especially the Popes had governed Christendom for some centuries, had now lost much of their reputation and their influence, and could no longer serve the interests of Papacy, either as efficiently or as effectually as in former times. A society, therefore, like that of Jesus, with a General at its head so fanatically devoted to the Popes as Ignatius—bigoted, uncompromising, and ready to go all lengths; fiercely cruel, perfidious, and dead to all the common feelings of humanity, yet uniting in its bosom all the arts and sciences, and all the varied talent and learning of that period, was the one above all others that the necessities of the Papal Church then required.

The advantage to be derived from these new auxiliaries in the warfare with heretics was soon perceived by the sovereigns of other countries, as well as by the hierarchy. Honours and endowments flowed in rapidly; the number of applicants for

admission as novices of the Society, from men of all nations, ranks, and professions, was incredibly great; and three years after its foundation, the Pope, at the request of Ignatius, annulled the clause which had limited the number to threescore, leaving it with no other restriction than the discretion of its General. Sixteen years after the establishment of this order Loyola, its founder, expired; but not before he had seen his followers spread over the whole surface of the globe, and giving laws, under him, to all nations.

That the religion of the Romish Church was neither increased in the chastity of its morals, nor in the purity of its doctrines since the Jesuits were added to the various other orders, we have the testimony alike of both Catholic and Protestant authors of the highest authority; neither was it formed to the only standard of truth, the "Holy Scriptures." As to doctrines of faith, the Jesuits, with at least the connivance of the Romish prelates, entirely subverted such of the first principles of Christianity as the Council of Trent had left untouched. They lowered the dignity and the utility of the sacred Scriptures; detracted so much from the greatness of Christ's merits as almost to make the Pope his equal; and, in fine, by their sophistical reasonings and fallacious impiety, had almost succeeded in extinguishing in

men the light of Divine knowledge, and the belief in any practical Christianity.

It is very probable the Jesuits would have taught otherwise, if the Romish pontiffs had wished them to use their efforts to render the church more holy, and more approaching to that of Christ; but they could not teach otherwise then, neither can they now, so long as they are instructed to make it their first care that the Popes may hold what they have gotten, and recover, by any means, what they have lost, and that the prelates and priests of Rome may once more become rich and powerful. Hence, notwithstanding their glaring impieties, the blasphemy of their doctrine, and the infamous, though well-concealed profligacy of their lives, the Papal power could never be persuaded, though pressed by the strongest arguments and exhortations, to pass any severe censures upon the Jesuits, who, like certain weeds, spring up the stronger the oftener they have been cut down, and apparently crushed beneath the foot.

That the Jesuits did not so much corrupt and vitiate the doctrine of morals in all its parts as *destroy* morality altogether, is the universal complaint of innumerable writers of every class and society of men in the Romish Church, since they adduce from their books (which will form the succeeding chapters of this work) that professedly treat of the right

mode of living, and especially from the writings of those called Casuists, principles alike opposed to religion, to honour, and to virtue.

The Jesuits hold an intermediate place between the *monks* and the *secular clergy*, and approach nearest to the order of *regular canons*. For while they live like monks, secluded from the multitude and bound by vows, yet they are exempted from the most onerous duties of *monks*, as stated hours of prayer. They are divided into three classes: namely, the *professed*, who live in the houses of the professed; the scholastics, who teach, and often reside in colleges; and the novices, who reside in houses specially appointed for them. The professed are few in number; of much experience, prudent, learned, and skilful in business, in a word, true Jesuits. The mysteries of the Society are only imparted to a few even of the professed, aged men, of long experience, and of the most tried character. The other classes are rather associates of the Jesuits than real Jesuits. The General of the order holds his office for life, and has a select council to advise him and to execute his orders. His authority over the whole order, and every person, business, and thing connected with it is absolute; nor is he accountable to any other earthly superior, except the Pope. Over each province there is a provincial, whose power is equally despotic over his portion of the Society. He visits

and inspects all the houses of his province, requires regular monthly returns to be made him from every section of the province of all that is transacted, learnt, or contemplated; and then makes returns every three months to the General. Every person belonging to the order is continually inspected and trained to *implicit obedience*, *secrecy*, and *fidelity* to the order. The whole Society is like a regular army, completely officered, trained to service, and governed all over the world by the will of one man.

In less than half a century after the formation of the order, they had established themselves in every Roman Catholic country; their number soon became great, and their wealth increased with amazing rapidity; and they were equally celebrated by the friends and dreaded by the enemies of the Romish faith, as the most able and enterprising order in the church. The monks were called to work out their own salvation by extraordinary acts of mortification and self-denial; but the Jesuits were taught to consider themselves as formed for action; as chosen soldiers, bound to *exert themselves* constantly to the service of the Pope, *God's* vicar on earth. To reclaim or oppose the enemies of the Holy See is their proper object. Being exempt from those vocations which constitute the chief business of the other orders, they are required to attend to all the transactions of the world. They are directed to study the disposi-

tions and peculiar weaknesses of persons of high rank; to worm their way into their confidence, to enable them, under the guise of friendship, to betray their secrets to the Provincial: thus, by the very constitution and genius of the order, a spirit of action and intrigue is infused into all its members. Every novice is obliged once a week to manifest his conscience to his superior (who has all the power of an absolute monarch), and to discover not only his sins and defects, but all the inclinations, passions, and wishes of his soul. Each member is directed to observe the words and actions of the novice, and bound to disclose everything concerning him to his superior.

Before the expiration of the sixteenth century the Jesuits had obtained the chief direction of the education of youth in every Roman Catholic country in Europe; had become the confessors of almost all its monarchs, and the spiritual guides of almost every person eminent for rank or power. They mingled in all affairs, civil and ecclesiastical; took part in every intrigue and revolution; and at different times were the directors of the most considerable courts in Europe. They have always been the most zealous patrons of those doctrines which tend to exalt ecclesiastical power on the ruins of civil government; and even in these times have claimed for papal Rome a jurisdiction as extensive and as absolute as

was ever put forth by the most presumptuous pontiffs in the darkest ages of the world. They have contended for the entire independence of priests as distinct from civil government; and, lastly, they have both taught and published such treacherous tenets concerning the duty of dethroning princes, as have led to the commission of the most atrocious crimes, tending to dissolve every human tie which can bind man to man or connect subjects with their rulers. In short, they are fearfully responsible before God and man for the effects of that corrupt and dangerous casuistry which has disseminated tenets so extravagant concerning ecclesiastical power; and for that intolerant spirit, which, while it has disgraced the Church of Rome, has inflicted so many persecutions and brought so many calamities upon society. That this is not a Protestant view of the case we may most correctly judge from the circumstance that, within little more than two centuries (1555 to 1773), the Jesuits have been ignominiously expelled, on 37 occasions, from various states, as the violators of all moral and social obligations, and the enemies of the human race. Such of these expulsions as took place during the 18th century occurred in states the most devoted to the Romish faith, viz. Savoy, 1729; Portugal, 1759; Spain and the Two Sicilies, 1767; Parma, 1768; Malta, 1768. Lastly, as if to crown the whole by a most signal and

exemplary instance, they were in 1773 suppressed at Rome, and in all Christendom, by a bull of Pope Clement XIV. This prelate was cautious and temperate in disposition, not unaware of the importance to the Church of the services of this order. He had within his reach, in the archives of the Propaganda, sources of information to which the rest of the world could have no means of access. He deliberated upon these and the pleadings of the Society in its own justification, during four years, and at the conclusion of that interval deliberately set his hand to the instrument of suppression. Thus, *ex cathedrâ*, he pronounced the Society to be inherently wicked and mischievous, dangerous to the peace of the world, and unworthy of any longer toleration.

The bull, therefore, of Pope Clement amounted to a verdict against the Jesuits, who had been accused of *insatiable avidity* for temporal possessions, *dangerous seditions, massacres, hatreds, enmities, prevarications* which must destroy all social confidence, and *treasonable practices* such as endangered the safety of all governments, and the welfare and stability of all civilization and society.

No one can have perused the page of history with attention, without perceiving that the machinations of the Jesuits have proved the fruitful source of all the public commotions and disorders which, for the last 300 years, have convulsed the whole surface of

Christian Europe. Such as the murders by their order of Henry the Third and of Henry the Fourth of France, the repeated attempts at assassinating Elizabeth of England, the Gunpowder Plot under James, the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes, the subjection of Portugal to Spain, the attempt on the life of the King, the revolution in Venice—are but a few of the foul blots which must ever rest upon their character; and when we add to this list their oppression of the natives in Guiana and California, their apostasy in China, their licentiousness and impiety in Malabar, we are still very far from the completion of that black and revolting catalogue of crime with which they have been charged by the unanimous voice of all historians. In looking even to the history of our own times, we find them still "*unchanging and unchanged*"—the same in principle, and only waiting for their opportunity. Nor is it without reason that they have been suspected of poisoning Pope Clement XIV., who issued the bull for their suppression. One of their order is known to have followed the armies of Napoleon, and to have given information which partly contributed to his defeat by the Russians; and on the return of the Bourbons, it was not long before they succeeded in gaining such an influence in the councils of Louis XVIII. and Charles X. as led to the Revolution of 1830, and to the final dethronement of that family.

To the same fruitful source of mischief we may trace the revolution of Belgium, which separated that country from Holland, and placed Leopold on its throne, the rebellion in Poland, and the present Republic in France. On whatever side we turn our eyes, whether to Spain or Austria, to Sardinia, to Naples, or to Hungary, to Switzerland, to Rome, or to the shores of our own country, there we may trace the disastrous and malignant effects of their interference. Verily, if ever the "*Spirit of Evil*" could be typified on earth, it is to be found in the Society of the Jesuits! In vain would they tell us, that they are prohibited by their constitutions from taking part in politics; do they suppose that the whole world is blind and deaf, or that all mankind are mistaken as to their real character? Let us only refer to the bull for their suppression, and to the chronicles of every country in Europe, to show the absurdity of such a defence.

The early history of Poland alone may well serve (unless we blindly close our eyes to facts) as a sad warning to England; for it is in the records of the past that we may ever gain wisdom and instruction for the present and the future. Were it not so, indeed, history had opened its luminous pages for us in vain, and its study and perusal would tend to as little practical purpose or utility as the search after the Philosopher's Stone, or the talisman of perpetua'

youth, which characterised the pursuits of the philosophers and chemists of the middle ages.

Poland was one of the earliest countries where the Reformation was first established, and yet was eventually and utterly put down by Romanism. How did this happen? There was a small and out-of-the-way town in that kingdom called Braunsburg; here it was that the Polish Bishop Hosius (in his heart a Romanist) planted, like Mr. Weld, *a colony of Jesuits in disguise; was it not exactly so at Stonyhurst?* for I see, on turning to an old directory of 1795, they were not designated as Jesuits, but as "*gentlemen of the English Academy at Liege.*" At Braunsburg the Jesuits opened schools for the education of the young, and especially for the children of the nobles and higher classes. For some years, *as* in England, they kept quiet and alarmed nobody, acting, while it suited them, the parts of quiet and harmless religious people. *But they were biding their time!* When once they felt their footing sure, then commenced the downward course of Protestantism. By a series of dark and stealthy conspiracies, they brought back a free and prosperous kingdom to slavery, to superstition, and to Popery, planting their steps on that very law which gave free toleration to all sects. They left it to the nobles to make whom they would their priests, but they eventually contrived, by little and little, that every bishop must be a Roman

Catholic; such importance did they attach, *as they do now*, to that title. After a time a law was passed, that their king should always be a Romanist. Contrary to the fixed laws of Poland, they founded schools and colleges without number, while by the secret influence they possessed they escaped punishment; and wherever the political liberties of the country interfered with Romanism, where they could not openly crush, they secretly undermined them, till no vestige of either civil or religious liberty remained. Diminished in numbers, persecuted, disunited, their children taken forcibly from them to be educated in Romish schools, the Protestants of Poland were virtually annihilated in 1655. Let Lord Dudley Stuart and the other friends of Poland tell us what that once great and flourishing country has been ever since—while under the yoke of Rome! These gentlemen can be eloquent enough about the effects, would that they were equally so about the causes which have produced them! Was not the avowed object of the Jesuits then what it is now, and ever will be so long as they are suffered to exist as a society—the destruction of Protestantism by any and every means, exalting Popery and Romanism upon its ruins? Shall we suffer Stonyhurst to be our Braunsburg?

Scattered in all the corners of the world, they cannot be sufficiently guarded against, for they are

everywhere, though they may not be seen or suspected. They were mixed up with every conspiracy against our Queen Elizabeth and King James. The names of Parry, Parsons, and Campion are familiar to all; of Garnett, the mover of the Gunpowder Plot; of Allen and Tolet and Blackwell, the founders and leaders of the English Seminary and Jesuit colleges at Douay and Rome and elsewhere. Dissimulation, perfidy, and fraud have ever been the instruments resorted to in their championship of Roman Catholic ascendancy, and their devotional invocations derogatory to the Redeemer and the great work of his atonement. Neither let it be forgotten that they have been expelled nearly forty times from different nations of the world, Romish as well as Protestant, because the stability of thrones and the freedom of nations was found to be incompatible with their stay. In 1773, as we have said, Clement XIV. suppressed the order, when they took refuge in Russia, and other countries which cared not for Papal authority. But the Pope knew that his act would bring upon him an untimely death from their vengeance; an apprehension verified by the event. In 1814 Pope Pius VII. restored the order, though more from fear, it is said, than any other cause. In 1817 they were expelled from Russia. The Roman Catholic Relief Bill of 1829 expressly provided for their gradual suppression. It enacted that Jesuits already in England, or

English Jesuits abroad already made, but wishing to return, should be registered; and that no new Jesuits should be made here, or, if made abroad, be allowed to come to England under severe penalties: and that a yearly return of all the Jesuits in England should be laid before Parliament. In 1830 the number of Jesuits in Ireland was 58, and in England 117. But are there no more than that number now? Since 1814 they have been again legalized in Christendom, and have spread over Great Britain. In 1838 they had eight colleges among us; and now they have eleven!!! Of their dangerous character, and their insidious, unscrupulous, and indefatigable efforts to overthrow the Church of England, the fate of Poland ought to be a sufficient warning.

Let us not think that the enlightenment of the age or the power of the press is sufficient to defend us from their attacks, for there is reason to believe, that a considerable portion of the press is more or less under their influence; and if they can succeed in stifling the spirit of inquiry by their doctrines of absolute submission, the enlightenment of the age may be as fugitive as the polish of that of Louis XIV., and may conceal the deadness and corruption of a cold heart and a seared conscience. Peter the Great, in the ukase by which he expelled them in 1719, thus expressed the feeling which will be re-echoed by every mind which is informed as to their true character:—

"It is," said he, "after seeing with our own eyes their conduct in foreign countries, and with astonishment that the other sovereigns of Europe still tolerate them, that we have resolved to prohibit their continuance in our States."

We shall now proceed to show, by some extracts from their principal writers, how unscrupulous they are as to the means which they employ in seeking their ends, and how completely the principles they inculcate are opposed to Scripture and to ordinary morality. In reading these extracts it should be borne in mind, that these opinions do not, like those of other authors, rest simply upon their own evidence or upon the authority of the writers themselves; but as no Jesuit is allowed to print any book without the direct sanction of the Superior, so these works, which have never been repudiated by the Society, must be considered to set forth the deliberate and approved opinions of the whole body, which must therefore be considered responsible for them and for their consequences. This point is strikingly illustrated by the following extract from the *Imago Primi Sæculi.*

"The members of the Society are dispersed through every corner of the world, distinguished by as many nations and kingdoms as the earth has intersections; but this is a division arising from diversity of place, not of affection; a dissimilarity of countenance, not

of morals. In this association, the Latin thinks with the Greek, the Portuguese with the Brasilian, the Irishman with the Sarmatian, the Englishman with the Belgian: and among so many different dispositions there is no strife, no contention; nothing which affords opportunity of discovering that they are more than one. . . . The place of their nativity affords them no personal advantage. . . . The same design, the same manner of life, the same uniting vow, combines them. . . . The pleasure of a single individual can cause the whole Society to turn and return, and determine the revolution of this numerous body, which is easily moved, but with difficulty shaken."—*Proleg.*, p. 33, lib. v.

"The Constitutions ordain three things. The first, that our members do not introduce new opinions. The second, that if, at any time, they should hold an opinion contrary to that which is commonly received, they shall adhere to the decision of the Society. The third, that in controverted questions, in which either opinion is far from being common, they restrict themselves to conformity; that thus we may all hold the same doctrines and the same language, according to the apostle."—*Daniel.*, congreg. v., decret. 50, n. 2.

The following passages must therefore be considered as containing, not merely the unauthorized opinions of the persons whose names are prefixed, but as the deliberate matured dicta of the Society at

hange; and it will on this account be the less necessary to multiply them.

By these extracts, we shall show more fully how the Jesuits teach—that a bad man who is an entire stranger to the love of God, provided he feels some fear of the divine wrath, and from dread of punishment, avoids grosser crimes, is a fit candidate, and properly prepared, for eternal salvation; that men may sin with safety, provided they have a reason for the sin; that actions in themselves wicked, and contrary to the Divine law, are allowable, provided a person can control his own mind, and in his thoughts connect a good *end* with the criminal deed—or, as they express it, knows how *to direct his intentions aright; that philosophical sins*, that is, actions which are contrary to the law of nature, and to right reason, in a person ignorant of the written law of God, or dubious as to its true meaning, are light offences and do not deserve the punishments of hell; that the deeds which a man commits when wholly blinded by his lusts and the paroxysm of passion, and destitute of all sense of religion, though they be of the vilest and most execrable character, can by no means be charged to his account in the judgment of God, because such a man can only be considered in the light of a person deprived of reason; that it is right for a man when taking an oath, or forming a contract, in order to deceive the judge,

and subvert the validity of an oath or covenant, tacitly to add something to the words of the oath; and various other sentiments, equally deficient in all the principles of honour, of morality, or of religion.

No change is even pretended to have taken place in their system or in their principles. What they have been, they still are: the most crafty, subtle, and dangerous conspirators, terrible when *possessed* of power; meek, quiet, courteous, laborious, assiduous, reckless of labour, and regardless of all moral obstacles, when only *aiming* at the possession of power.

Nor can we help remarking, that the re-establishment of the Jesuits, and the apparent friendship subsisting between that dangerous sect and the Roman Catholics in general, is a sign that betokens anything but an improvement in the principles and views of Papists.

In former times this crafty and treacherous Society was the object of a common proscription in all the Catholic countries, and was dissolved by the head of the Romish Church. Another Pontiff has once more called it into being, and it is being helped forward with all their power and energy by all devoted Catholics, for the purpose of aiding them in exterminating all Protestants, which they consider as a sacred duty, whenever and wherever it can be safely attempted.

Let those Protestants who are ever calling out for

the religious liberty of all sects bear in mind the decision of the University of Paris, who in 1594 passed an act banishing the Jesuits as "corruptors of youth, disturbers of the public repose, and enemies of the king and state;" and erected a column in commemoration of a plot, which they declared to have sprung from the pestilent heresy of that pernicious sect the Jesuits, who, concealing the most abominable crimes under the guise of piety, had publicly taught the assassination of kings, and attempted the life of Henry the Fourth.

It is sufficiently clear that those who could acknowledge a perfect contempt of all moral principle, could not be expected to stop short at any obstacle, or hesitate for one moment forcibly to remove it. And therefore it is, even in these days, that we are fully prepared for conspiracy, rebellion, and assassination.

Let those who would shake their heads incredulously at these assertions turn to the pages of the *Secreta Monita*, for a full confirmation of all that has been already stated.

Never let it be forgotten by Englishmen, whatever may be their shade of politics, that all the civil and religious liberty which we now enjoy—that glorious Constitution, uniting Church and State, which was established on Reformed and Protestant principles, had cleared itself from the errors and corruptions of

the Romish religion, and cast out the jurisdiction of the Pope from this realm of England. Thus a pure and holy faith had been restored, and the true and spiritual worship of God has been established among us. And not only since the Reformation did England possess and zealously retain these privileges for herself, but she also endeavoured to extend and procure them for other countries. As "the land shadowing with wings," she lent her aid and protection, threw the shield of her power over others, that they might enjoy like blessings, political and religious, with herself. Thus she became the centre, the bulwark, the stronghold of God's truth in the world, defending all that was holy, scriptural, and good; and protesting against all that was false, superstitious, and iniquitous. And what has Rome, aided by her devoted friends and counsellors the Jesuits, been about ever since? Has she been idle? Ah, no! the page of history, the undying records of the past, protest against such a supposition! Rome has been ever forward to approve of every deed, however dark and desperately wicked, which tended to her strength or to her advancement; being blasphemous enough to return thanks to God for the effects of such wickedness and cruelty. The cry of unnumbered martyrs, those holy men of old, who sealed their faith in the true doctrines of the Gospel by their life's blood, has gone forth against her.

All the righteous blood of the saints, the burnings, the tortures, and imprisonments of the faithful, will be required at her hands. These all lie unrepented of and unforgiven, on the doomed head of apostate Rome and her ministers of evil, the Society of Jesus!

The Society of Jesus! what an awful profanation of that name—the God and Saviour of mankind—whose whole life was spent in doing good, in preaching repentance of sins, peace, and goodwill. The assumption of the name of Jesus by this order seems to betray the craft of Satan, distinguished by his lies and blasphemies against God. Verily, here we have as the Scripture foretold, that great fiend himself "transformed into an angel of light." He adopts the name of Jesus in forming an association the most implacably hostile to the very name he has assumed, and the cause he professes to advance. Who is not won by the most adorable and endearing of all names, the name of Jesus? But here we find it affixed to such a combination of subtlety, malice, and wickedness, as was never before seen among men.

But are the Jesuits, such casuists and philosophers as we find them from their writings, really bound in heart and soul to Pope and Popery? We answer no; but only so far as, by means of them, they can advance themselves, and extend their power and influence over the world. They obey the one as

most likely of any existing power to favour them and be their friend; they adopt and propagate the other only as the most corrupt system of doctrine and practice in the world, by which they can most successfully prosecute their own ends, and under cover of which they can best carry out their own principles. It is not Popery as Popery merely, the religion of the Papacy, which they advocate, but Popery as the most delusive and destructive system of faith, and therefore affording the greatest scope for the gratification of the corrupt and sensual propensities of the human heart under the cloak and sanction of religion. But they have shown themselves to have no scruple at sacrificing both Pope and Popery when the interests of their own Order were at stake. The system and teaching of the Jesuits is to expel all that is divine, to destroy all that is human, and to encourage all that is fiend-like, in the nature of man. Not to restore man to the holy image of God, but to degrade him to the standard of the devil. The end and object, once fixed and determined, it suffers nothing to stand between man and the attainment of them. No falsehood too base, no hypocrisy too fruitless, no crime too flagrant, no action too unnatural and inhuman, but any and all of them will be put in practice to insure the success of the plan to be pursued.

With all this dark catalogue of crimes before them, it may well be asked by our readers, Why kings, nobles, and so many people, in all ages and in all times, of every rank and of both sexes, have preferred Jesuits to any other order for the care of their souls? The answer is not difficult to give. It is because they hear precepts from them which extenuate the vilest crimes, the most disgraceful sins, pamper the wicked lusts of their penitents*, and open a most easy road to heaven, without the necessity of repentance or God's forgiveness of their sins.

The spirits of thousands of these victims to their delusive arts—of the widow, of the orphan, and of the fatherless—of the young, the old, the feeble, and the strong—cry aloud to heaven for vengeance upon this order.

The sovereigns and people of every clime in Europe, whatever might have been their differences on other matters, have cordially united both hand and heart together in expelling them from their soil as the pests and plague-spots of society, the destroyers of all religion, morality, and honour, and as the most inveterate enemies of the human race. England alone enjoys the unenviable privilege of nourishing these deadly vipers in her bosom, which

* "Quando odiosa eorum facta dissimulant, sed in meliorem potius partem ea interpretantur."—*Secret Monita*, c. ii., sec. ii.

are slowly but surely twisting their insidious coils around her to compass, unless God helps us, her ruin and destruction.

Englishmen and fellow countrymen, wake from your long slumber—your dreams of fancied security, and arouse yourselves in earnest, for verily, though a secret, yet is Jesuitism a fearful enemy to contend with! Strike at and drive away this reptile from our peaceful shores while yet it is in your power! Take warning from other countries before it is too late. In every region where its sway has predominated, or where its influence has extended itself, its withering touch has been felt even on the soil; enterprise and science have been checked or crushed by its exclusiveness and rapacity; and life and property, man's honour and woman's chastity, have been equally insecure from the lustful and intriguing disposition of its associates. If your homes and your firesides and country are yet dear to you, if you regard peace in this world and happiness in another state, suffer not thousands of your fellow countrymen to be educated in the schools of Jesuits and indoctrinated in all their sin and wickedness.

A sacred trust is reposed in your hands: use well your power, for you are responsible in the eyes of both God and man, if you abuse it or neglect the means of safety while still within your reach. Once more I say, arouse yourselves! form leagues, clubs,

societies, associations, and let your voice and prayer simultaneously be heard from all parts of that vast empire on which the sun never sets, ringing like thunder in the ears of the vacillating government of this country—*banish the Jesuits from the soil of England.* Be firm, united, and uncompromising in your demand, for it is a just and holy one, and a duty you no less owe to God, your country, your neighbour, and yourselves; and no ministry, no government, even with a factious opposition of priest-ridden members to back them, will dare resist such a manifestation of popular feeling, or provoke the chance of a rebellion of the united Protestants of England. A rebellion of Roman Catholics might be deplored; but it would be as a drop of water in the ocean, compared with the unanimous rising of the Protestants of this country against the Romanizing policy of their rulers—a movement and a revolution which would shake the whole world to its very centre.

DOCTRINES AND MORALITY

OF

THE JESUITS.

ON THE KNOWLEDGE OF GOD.

The Jesuit Filliucius teaches us that we are not required to make any effort in order to attain to a knowledge of our duties and of our obligations. "It seldom happens," he tells us, "or rather it *never happens*, that a man is under any indispensable requisition to prepare for the grace of emerging from his ignorance."*

But why does Filliucius plead thus the cause of ignorance? Pulton, another Jesuit, shall reply. The reason is, that where there is no knowledge of God, there can be no sin†.

This conclusion has been admitted by the Cardinal

* Raro aut nunquam tenetur homo se præparare ad gratiam ut tollat ignorantiam.—*Filliuc. Quest. Mor.*, tom. ii., tr. 21, c. 10, p. 44, col. 1, n. 372.

† Non dari potest peccatum sine aliqua Dei notitiâ.—Pult. n a *Thesis* defended at Liége, Feb. 19, 1687. Conclus. 19.

Sfondrate, without a blush. He has recognised and taught it more openly than even Molina, his master. "To be ignorant," he says, "of the being of a God, ought to be regarded as a great blessing and favour; for, as sin is essentially an offence committed against God, it follows that a man who is without a knowledge of him, has neither offence, sin, nor eternal punishment to fear."*

Who would have imagined that a priest and cardinal of Rome could advance such an impious doctrine? The book in which this blasphemy was taught was printed at Rome, under the direction of Cardinal Albani, afterwards Pope Clement XI.

Conceiving, with Sfondrate and Molina, that to know nothing of the being of a God is a great favour and blessing from heaven, how could Albani suffer men to seek the knowledge of God by reading the Sacred Volume?

Preston and Sabran, both Jesuits, tell us, that, "supposing a man to have no knowledge of God, it is impossible for him to commit sin."† But how impossible? Hear Fathers Blondel and Eberson,

* Deum ignorare.....id quoque magna beneficii et gratiæ pars fuit: cum enim peccatum sit essentialiter offensio et injuria Dei, sublata Dei cognitione, necessario sequitur nec injuriam, nec peccatum, nec æternam pœnam esse.—*Sfondr. Nod. Præd. Dissol.*, part i., parag. 2, p. 152.

† Facta igitur hypothesis, quod Deus sub nullo conceptu cognoscatur, impossibile erit peccare.—In a *Thesis* maintained at Liége, in October, 1681. Conclus. 11.

other Jesuits: "It is necessary," they inform us, "to the commission of sin, that we have some knowledge of God."* And this is a point so indisputable, that the Jesuit Roderic de Arriaga, one of their authors of the greatest authority, asserts that, "in case of such ignorance, a man does not in anywise sin mortally in committing homicide, though it was his intention to commit it."†

Let it not be imagined that the Jesuits disavowed this doctrine of Arriaga's; on the contrary, he was a man on whom they lavished their fullest praise. "He was worthy," they inform us, "on account of the fineness of his mind, his eminent doctrine, and commendable virtues, to be ranked amongst the greatest luminaries of the Society."‡

SINS OF IGNORANCE.

THE Jesuit Merat tells us that, "there are some general principles of the law of nature, of which a

* Requiritur ad peccatum aliqua notitia Dei.—In a *Thesis* maintained at Liége, May 11, 1689. Conclu. 20.

† Ergo talis homo ignorans Deum non peccabit mortaliter, etiamsi alium occidat, et putet se malefacere.—In his *Course of Theology*, tom. i. *Treatise on the Trinity and Unity of the Godhead*, disp. 2, sect. 3, p. 31.

‡ Vir omnium judicio ob subtilitatem ingenii, doctrinæ præstantiam, et virtutis commendationem, inter primas Societatis lumina merito collocandus.—In the *Library of their Authors*, page 729.

man may be invincibly ignorant, not indeed through the whole of his life, but during a short time, and even for a considerable time; such, for instance, as that he ought not to steal, to commit murder or adultery; or that it is his duty to worship the Almighty, to respect his parents, and *the like*."*

The Jesuit fathers, Darell and Skinner, in a Thesis defended at Liége, June 20, 1691, conclusion 20th, maintained that, "a sin, however enormous and repugnant to nature it may be, is not mortal" (*i. e.*, is only trivial and excusable) "when it is committed by a person invincibly ignorant of God, or who, in committing it, does not consider that there is a God, or that sin is offensive in his sight"!

Platelle, another Jesuit, asserts the same: "However enormous, or repugnant to nature, a sin may be that is committed by a man invincibly ignorant of God, or that God is offended by such an act, that sin is not mortal; for as there is in it neither virtual nor implicit contempt of God, it is compatible with perfect love, and the friendship of the Deity."†

"If any one," says Father de Rhodes, "commit

* Principalia aliqua universalia legis naturæ, ut sunt hæc, non esse furandum, occidendum, adulterandum, parentes honorandos, et similia; etsi non possunt ignorari invincibiliter toto humanæ vitæ tempore, possunt tamen aliquo brevi, imo etiam satis longo.—*Merat's Disputations on the Theological Summary of St. Thomas*, tom. ii. *Treatise on Sins*, disp. 9, sec. 7, page 577, col. 2.

† Peccatum quamtumvis graviter rationi repugnans, commissum

adultery or an homicide, at the same time reflecting even on the wickedness and enormity of these actions, but only in a very imperfect and superficial manner, his sin is merely venial, though the acts themselves are exceedingly heinous. The reason is, that as a knowledge of the wickedness of an action is necessary to render it sinful, so, in order to be guilty of heinous sin, a man must have an entire knowledge of its wickedness, and must duly consider this at the time of committing the sin."*

It follows, therefore, as a natural consequence of the above principle of the Jesuits, that the hardened, the villanous, and every other class of the profligate, who drink in iniquity as water, are sinners no longer; since they have attained the felicity of having extinguished every feeling and reflection of their own bosoms. The Jesuit Pirot, the author of the "Apology for the Casuists," has taught this in the name of the whole Society: "Yes," says he, "if men who are become perfectly accomplished in sin have

ab invincibiliter ignorante, aut non advertente Deum esse, aut peccatis offendi, non est mortale. Stare potest cum charitate perfecta et amicitia divina.—*Platelle's Synopsis cursus Theologici*, part 2, c. 3, t. 3, n. 189, pp. 116 and 117.

* Si quis committat adulterium, aut homicidium, advertens quidem malitiam et gravitatem eorum, sed imperfectissime tamen et levissime; ille quantumvis gravissima sit materia, non peccat tamen nisi leviter. Ratio est, quia sicut ad peccatum requiritur cognitio malitiæ, sic ad grave peccatum requiritur plena et clara cognitio et consideratio illius.—*De Rhodes's Theologie Scholastique*, tom. 1., tr. 3. *Des Actes Hum.*, disp. 2, ques. 2, sec. 1, parag. 2, col. 2.

neither light nor remorse when they blaspheme and plunge themselves into debauchery, and if they have no knowledge of the wickedness of such conduct, I maintain, with all the theologians (Jesuits), that, by these actions, which savour more of the brute than the man, they do not sin at all; because, without liberty there can be no sin; and to be at liberty to avoid sin, it is requisite for us to know the good or the evil of the object that is proposed to us."*

Finally, Father de Rhodes teaches, that, in certain circumstances, crimes become virtues. "If you are unavoidably led to believe that to tell a lie for the purpose of saving your friend is a virtuous act, your lie," says he, "is in that case a work of mercy. If you think that it is a good thing to kill a man who blasphemes, such an act of homicide is converted into one of religion."† Moreover, it should be understood that Father de Rhodes held no mean rank among the Jesuits. After teaching divinity for thirteen years, he was made Rector, on account of his merit, of the Jesuit's College at Lyons. His doctrine, of which we have given a few specimens, was approved by three theologians of the Society, and afterwards printed with the approbation of

* *Apology*, page 38.

† Si existimes invincibiliter, quod mentiri est actus virtutis ad salvandum amicum, mendacium tuum erit opus misericordiæ. Si putes bonum esse occidere hominem qui blasphemat, erit opus religionis illud homicidium.—Tom. i., *Des Actes Hum.*, pag. 724, col. 1.

Father Grannon, the Provincial of Lyons; lastly, he was classed among the number of the illustrious authors of the Society*.

ON SERVILE FEAR.

We need scarcely be surprised in turning over the page of history, to find the dreadful state of crime and of wickedness in which mankind, in Roman Catholic countries, were plunged while under the special training and teaching of the Jesuits. Probably, no doctrine tended more to produce this low ebb of morals—this total disregard to both virtue and religion—than that of servile fear, which the Jesuits substituted for that love and cheerful obedience to the "Almighty," one of the distinguishing characteristics of the real Christian of all ages.

With a fear unaccompanied by love—a fear entirely servile, which they called attrition, or imperfect contrition, the Jesuits taught that every sinner might be reconciled to God in the "Sacrament of Penitence:" "That sorrow which has for its precise object the merited pains of hell," says the Jesuit

* Vide the *Library of the Jesuit Authors*, page 293, col. 2.

Bauny, "is sufficient for our justification in the sacrament."*

The Jesuits of Louvain held the same doctrine: "There is," they inform us, "no reason for astonishment, that attrition excited by the fear of hell, sufficiently prepares the sinner to receive the grace of the Sacrament of Penitence."†

Father Pinthereau, in a book which he has published, places it beyond all doubt that this is the sentiment of the whole Society. He there informs us that "the Jesuits teach, by unanimous consent, as a doctrine truly catholic, consistent with the faith, and conformable to the decisions of the Council of Trent, that attrition *only*, and that even excited solely by the dread of hell, is required at the sacrament."‡

Such was the doctrine of the whole Society about the middle of the last century, and we shall see that their successors have not thought differently. "We maintain," says Father Slaughter, "as an *incontestable* truth, that it is by no means necessary to bring to the sacrament of penitence that perfect contrition which implies love to God above every-

* In his *Summary of Sins*, chap. 41, page 687, 6th edition.

† Non mirum est attritione ex gehennæ metu concepta, debite peccatorem disponi, ac sufficienter ad gratiam sacramenti penitentiæ. —*Theses* of 1641, chap. 2, art. 18, p. 84, col. 2, n. 1.

‡ This book is entitled, *The Ignorance and Calumnies of a Libel, called The Moral Theology of the Jesuits.* See part 2, pages 50 and 51.

thing in the world. Attrition alone, and that known to be nothing more, is enough."* In another place he asserts, "The doctrine which maintains it as sufficient, is a doctrine morally certain in itself, and safe in point of practice."†

The Jesuits of Rome adopted the same language: "It suffices for obtaining the effect of justification, in the sacrament of penitence, to have a true and simple attrition, distinguishable from perfect contrition, which comprehends the love of God above all things. It is not necessary that this attrition should in any degree proceed from a motive of divine love; but it is enough that it arise entirely from the supernatural motive of fear."‡

This is what Father Raye maintained at Antwerp, in 1710: "Attrition," says he, "excited only by the fear of hell, without any true, formal, and explicit love of God, is sufficient to obtain justification in the sacrament."§

* Ut indubitatum, statuimus non requiri perfectam illam (*contritionem*) quæ amorem Dei includat appretiative summum..... sufficit attritio etiam cognita.—In his *Thesis* maintained at Liége, July 9, 1696, conclu. 49 and 50.

† De ipsa attritione quid statuendum est? Tuta in praxi, et moraliter certa sententia est.—In his *Thesis* of Nov. 12, 1697.

‡ Sufficit si procedat ex solo motivo supernaturali timoris.—In a *Thesis* maintained in their College at Rome, in 1700, conclu. 53.

§ Attritio quæ ex solo gehennæ metu sine ullo formali et explicito amore Dei benevolo concipitur, sufficit ad justificationem in sacramento consequendam.—In his *Thesis* of the 23rd of July of that year, page 16, pos. 26.

Who, after reading these passages, will not exclaim, Then there is not, as our Lord Jesus Christ declared, a *few* chosen*, but, on the contrary, the number is *very great*, and the gate which leads to life *is exceedingly wide*† ? Is there really a sinner, professing Christianity, who in his heart does not fear hell ?—who is not sorry for having offended God, not because God is supremely good, and infinitely worthy of our love, but because he is terrible in taking vengeance on sin ? Now this is all that is required in order to our justification in the sacrament!

It is true that the Jesuits would not have ascribed to slavish fear so wonderful an effect, but for the idea which they entertain that it is capable of converting the heart, and rendering sin odious. This they inculcate with incredible assurance. "Imperfect contrition," says Father de Maes, "called attrition, is a true penitence; whence we conclude, that the fear of hell can positively exclude every inclination to sin."‡

Father de Meyer, another Jesuit, asserts, that "imperfect contrition, excited only by the fear of hell, can positively remove every sinful desire from the mind."§ The Fathers Vander-Wœstine and Matin

* Matt. xxii. 14. † Ibid. vii. 14.

‡ Metus gehennæ posse se solo positive omnem excludere voluntatem peccandi.—In a *Thesis* defended at Louvain, December 12, 1691, pos. 4.

§ Imperfecta contritio ex solo metu gehennæ concepta, excludere

give us their sentiments as plainly as their colleagues whom we have quoted: "The fear of hell," they say, "can, of itself, banish even all internal desire to commit any mortal sin."* One of the same fathers, Vander-Wœstine, observes in another place, that "servile fear is good, inasmuch as it can not only arrest the hand, but also the will."†

Father Salton, a Jesuit of Poitiers, boldly taught the same doctrine in 1717; "The sinner," says he, by these motives," (*i. e.*, the deformity of sin, and the fear of hell,) "is truly converted to God, and absolutely turned from all mortal sin whatever; for there is no mortal sin to which these two motives do not extend."‡

To recite, on this point, a still greater number of passages from the theologians of the Society, would be superfluous; for this is a common and invariable doctrine of their school. To be convinced of this we have only to attend for a moment to the testimony which the Jesuits of Louvain have furnished in their famous Theses against Jansenius. The following

positive omnem voluntatem peccandi potest.—In a *Thesis* defended at Louvain, July 10, 1696, page 11, pos. 24.

* Timor gehennæ per se potest excludere omnem voluntatem, etiam internam, peccandi.—In a *Thesis* defended at Louvain, July 8, 1699, page 11, pos. 30.

† Timor servilis bonus est, neque manum tantum, sed et animum cohibere potest.—In his *Thesis* of the 13th of July, 1705, pos. 7, n. 7.

‡ Vere ad Deum convertitur, et absolute avertitur a quocunque lethali peccato, quoniam hæc motiva ad omnia lethalia peccata extenduntur.

short extract shall suffice: "There is, then, a fear produced by the threatened punishment of hell, which comprises all that is essential to true penitence, though it do not arise from any motive of love."*

ON LOVING GOD.

THE Jesuits having taught mankind that fear alone was sufficient to convert their souls, and reconcile them to God in the sacrament of penitence, it became requisite for their teachers to recover them from the false alarm which might have been occasioned by the anathema that St. Paul pronounces against all those who love not the Lord Jesus Christ†, and the declaration of St. John, that "he who loveth not, abideth in death."‡ Every Christian knows what is the first and great commandment: Thou shalt worship one God, and love him with all thy heart; and as this might have caused some trouble in the conscience, which fear might not remove, the Jesuits tell you that the precept, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, with all

* Timor ergo aliquis ex gehenna intentata conceptus, complectitur omnia quæ vera pœnitentia, et si non ex charitate profecta, comprehendit.—In the 2 chap., art. 16, page 76, col. 2, n. 3.

† 1 Cor. xvi. 22. ‡ 1 John iii. 14.

thy soul, and with all thy strength,"* does not signify that we are required to love him in *effect* or *really*. To conceive this would be to understand things too much according to the letter. Now "the letter killeth, but the Spirit giveth life."† All that Jesus Christ and his Apostles meant by these words, say they, is, *Thou shalt not hate the Lord thy God.* That this is the true sense of the words cannot be doubted; since it rests on the authority, not of Jesus Christ or the Apostles, but on that of the Jesuit Father Sirmond, "Behold," says he, "how great is the kindness of God: he has not so much commanded us to love as not to hate him."‡

According to this teaching, because God is good we need not love him, but may content ourselves with not hating him. This doctrine Father Pinthereau affirms to be "a holy doctrine, at all times authorized in the church of God, and opposed by none but the impious."§

Why, it may be asked, have the Jesuits thus banished all obligation to love God, especially when we would be reconciled to him in the sacrament of penitence? The reason is, love would be an obstacle to our reception of the principal effect of the sacra-

* Matt. xxii. 37. † 2 Cor. iii. 6.

‡ In his work entitled *The Defence of Virtue*, treat. 2, sect. 1, chap. 2 and 3.

§ See his book entitled *Calumnies and Ignorance*, &c., part 1, p. 62.

ments. "Yes," says Father Valentin, a Jesuit, "contrition, *i.e.*, sorrow for sin, excited by supreme love to God," (thus he defines it, lest he should be misunderstood,) "this contrition is not, in fact, necessary to the receiving of the principal effect of these two sacraments;" (of baptism and penitence;) "on the contrary, it is rather an obstacle." Hence he concludes that "a precept exacting contrition, to enable us to receive these sacraments in a suitable and effectual manner, would be foolish."*

To love God, according to the Jesuits, is an obstacle to conversion in the sacrament of penitence. After such proof who can doubt of what the Jesuits have affirmed, that "they have changed the face of Christianity, and caused the knowledge of it to spread on every hand,"† by teaching men to beware of loving God, especially when they would re-enter into favour with him.

But these learned doctors have penetrated still farther, and, ever fertile in making discoveries, have found out the difference between the old and the new covenants: under the old, men were required to love God; the new dispenses with that obligation. In a

* Contritio in re ipsa non est necessaria ad effectum primarium ejusmodi sacramentorum percipiendum: imo obstat potius, quominus ille sequatur. Igitur absurdum esset præceptum, quod contritionem ad eam rem requireret, ut convenienter et fructuose ista sacramenta suscipiantur.—In his *Comment. Theolog.*, tom. iv., quæst. 8, punct. 4, p. 1333.

† In the Preface to their *Image of the First Age of the Society.*

word, to love God above all things was very proper for a Jew; but for a Christian, a good fear, with the sacraments, is sufficient. Father Merat, celebrated in "the Society" for his learning, will give you a clear idea of the difference between the two covenants:—

"The evangelical law," says this eminent Jesuit, "is more mild than the law of Moses; inasmuch as it takes away the obligation which existed under that dispensation to feel contrition or sorrow for our sins, joined to the love of God: a state of mind so difficult to attain."*

Father Pinthereau expresses himself with equal perspicuity on the subject: "As the law of the New Testament," says he, "is a law of grace, made for children, and not for slaves, is it not proper that it should demand less on their part; and that God, on his part, should give more? It is not, therefore, without reason that he has cancelled the hard and grievous obligation of the law of rigour, to perform an act of perfect contrition, in order to our justification."†

Father Fabri, another writer and apologist of the Society, gives his sentiments not less freely against any obligation to love God. "If perfect contrition"

* See his *Disputations on the Summary of St. Thomas*, tom. iii., tr. on Penitence, disp. 19, sect. 2, p. 567, n. 7.

† In his work entitled *Des Impostures*, &c., part 2, p. 53.

(that is, such as implies a love of God above all things) "were required in the sacrament, our condition would be worse than that of the Jews before the coming of Christ. Now, *who* will venture to assert that *slaves* are treated with more lenity and tenderness than *children?*"*

Father Salton, in his work written at Poitiers, teaches the same doctrine: "If attrition," says he, "were not sufficient, the way of salvation would, in this particular, be more difficult under the law of grace than it was under the law of Moses, or that of nature."†

But it will be asked, have the Jesuits, then, absolutely annihilated the precept that requires us to love God? No; to do them justice, they acknowledge that there is a time when we are even bound to obey this precept. It is true that this time is not as soon as we have attained to the use of our reason; this would be too early. It is not when an adult would receive baptism; then attrition is enough, and it would be at least superfluous to add an act of love. But, perhaps, it is on a Sunday, or on the holidays. Oh, no; these are days too sacred. When is it, then?

* Si contritio perfecta in sacramento esset necessaria, longe pejoris conditionis essemus, quam Judæi ante Christi adventum.....quis dicat servos mitius et liberalius excipi quam filios?—See Dialogue 17, p. 366, col. 2, n. 38.

† Denique nisi sufficeret attritio, via salutis reddita esset ex hac parte difficilior in lege gratiæ, quam in lege Mosaica aut naturæ.—See his *Treatise on Penitence*, dissert. 2, chap. 7.

After we have received a particular favour from heaven? No; this would indicate too much a sense of obligation. Is it when we are under any violent temptation to sin? Strictly speaking, we *may*, in case of there being no other way of overcoming the temptation; but if there be any other, love is not required. We ask, once more, when therefore is the time? When a man suffers martyrdom? No. Is it in the moment of death? No. Is it, then, after we are dead? Yes; then I understand it will be necessary. But prior to that time, it is certain, according to Father Lesseau, that we are under no obligation to love God.

If any of my readers should deem my statement unsatisfactory, let them hear him speak for himself: "We are not obliged," says this pious Jesuit, "to love God on the holidays, nor at the time of our death, nor when God has bestowed upon us some particular favour, nor when we wish to receive baptism, nor when it becomes necessary to perform an act of contrition, nor when we have attained to the use of our reason, nor when we are called to suffer martyrdom; for in these cases attrition is sufficient."*

* Non omnibus diebus festis, nec in articulo mortis, nec cum aliquis singulari aliquo beneficio a Deo afficitur, nec cum vult baptismum suscipere, nec cum tenetur actum contritionis elicere, nec cum rationis usum assecutus est, tenetur quis actum amoris elicere, nec cum martyrium subeundum est, quia tunc sufficit attritio."—*In his Sheets*

Father Sirmond holds the same language; and it is he who introduces the case of the temptation; after which he adds, "Suarez observes, *by the way*, that there is a certain time when we are required to love God. But what time is that? Conceive, if you can; rather he has left us to make the discovery; acknowledging, in effect, that he could not answer the question. Now," continues Father Sirmond, "if this Doctor did not know the time, I cannot think of any person who does;"* whence we gather that when Hurtando de Mendoza affirmed that "we are required to love God once every year;" Coninch, that "we are bound to do it once in every three or four years;" and Henriquez, that "it becomes necessary every five years;" these three Jesuits spoke at random, not knowing what they said†.

Such requisitions would be a heavy yoke on the necks of Christians. Besides, as Father Sirmond has observed, Jesus Christ, by a particular act of grace, has delivered us, who are Christians, from this odious servitude. This remark was occasioned by the words of Jesus Christ—"If the Son shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed." "Yes," says this Jesuit, "we shall, I trust, agreeably to his own testimony, be

dictated at Amiens, where he taught cases of conscience, *Treatise on the Decalogue*, sect. 3, *On Charity*, art. 1.

* Vide his work in Defence of Virtue, treatise 2, sect. 1, chap. 2 and 3.

† See Escobar, tr. 1, ex. 2, n. 1; and tr. 5, ex. 4, n. 8.

even free from the intolerable yoke, with which some would load us, of loving God."† We see, then, that Jesus Christ himself has delivered us from the oppressive obligation of loving his Father and our Father, and of serving him in love.

Thus we see that if the Jesuits were appointed to judge the world, or, rather, were permitted to revise the proceedings of Jesus Christ in the great day, they would show him that he was absolutely in a mistake; and, placing things in their proper order, would cause the saints in heaven to descend into hell; and the trembling, affrighted devils to come forth from the awful abyss, and mount, together with all the condemned, to the highest heavens†: or, at least, they would change hell into paradise, because it is full of fear; and paradise into hell, because it is full of love.

ON THE WORSHIP DUE TO GOD.

THE Jesuits teach us that it is quite sufficient to fear God, without pretending to love him, in order to regain his favour. And to render the fitting homage

* Sirm., in his work above cited, tr. 3, p. 60.
† James ii. 19.

and adoration due to the High and Mighty Lord God of the universe, it is enough that we present ourselves before him with minds distracted with the things of this world, and hearts afar off and at enmity against his laws, and alienated from his service. "Yes," says the Jesuit Bauny, "as he who without the intention of committing idolatry should bow the knee before an idol, would, notwithstanding, be viewed as an idolater; so they who take part in the service ought to be considered as praying, though they may do it without attention;"* but he must, nevertheless, observe that external decency and composure suitable to such an act†. Gobat, the Jesuit, also states most explicitly that "voluntary distractions do not destroy the essence of vocal prayer."‡

What can be more clear than the decision of Platelle, the Jesuit, on this subject? "It is more probable that no internal attention, either formal or virtual, is required in repeating the office."§ What more demonstrative than the argument of Lorthioir the Jesuit? "To worship false gods, though it be with voluntary distraction, is a true act of idolatry;

* In his *Summary of Sins*, chap. 20, p. 335, 6th edition.

† Ibid., p. 336.

‡ Essentiam vocalis orationis consistere cum voluntatis distractionibus.—Tom. i., tr. 5, n. 842 and 843.

§ Videtur probabilius nullam omnino requiri attentionem internam, neque formalem, neque virtualem.—In his abridged *Course of Theology*, part 3, parag. 1.

therefore, to pray to the Almighty with voluntary distraction of mind, is a truly religious act."*

"It may be observed," continues Lorthioir, "that a greater attention is not required in attending mass than in reciting our prayers; on the contrary, less attention suffices; for, as the theologians" state, "it is more difficult to repeat prayers by one's self, with attention, than to be present, with attention, when another prays and offers the sacrifice."† "It must," he further tells us, "be laid down as a principle, that the other attention" (*i. e.*, that which implies the application of the mind and heart to God) "is not necessary to the accomplishment of the duty."‡

"Yes," says Filliucius, "an evil intention in attending the mass, as, for example, the intention of gazing with a lascivious eye on the females who may be present, is not contrary to the commandment. Hence, he who goes with such an intention discharges the duty required, provided he be sufficiently attentive;"§ that is to say, supposing he be not outwardly rude.

* Falsos Deos colere cum voluntaria distractione, est verus actus idolatriæ. Ergo est verus actus religionis Deum cum voluntaria distractione orare.—In his *Treatise on Moral Virtue*, n. 817, dictated at the Seminary of Tournay, in the year 1707 or 8.

† Ibid, n. 892. ‡ Ibid, n. 877.

§ Prava intentio conjuncta voluntati audiendi missam, ut aspiciendi fœminas libidinose, dum modo sit sufficiens attentio, non est contraria huic præcepto, quare satisfacit.—*Quæst. Mor.*, tom. 1, tr. 5, c. 7, p. 128, col. 1, n. 212.

Escobar's language is equally shameful. He says, "An evil intention, as, for instance, that of looking with carnal eyes on the women who may be present, is not inconsistent with the duty of attending the mass."*

Busembaum, in his work entitled "The Marrow of Moral Theology," styled by his colleagues, the Jesuits, "an entirely golden work," expresses himself in a manner equally impious: "If any one," says he, "assist at the mass out of vain glory, or even for the purpose of picking another man's pocket, he may, notwithstanding, fulfil the duty, though these acts be in themselves criminal."†

This opinion was not peculiar to the Jesuits of former years, for those of more modern times perfectly agree with their predecessors on this point. "In fact," says Father La Croix, the commentator of Busembaum, "though you should attend the mass with an evil intention, you would not fail to fulfil your duty; as, for example, if you should attend principally from a motive of vain glory, or a wish to gratify yourself during the service by gazing with impure desire on a young woman who might be present, you would nevertheless obey the precept which

* Non obest alia prava intentio, ut aspiciendi libidinose fœminas, priori conjuncta.—*Theol. Mor.*, tr. 1, ex. 2, c. 3, p. 231, n. 31.

† Si quis intersit sacro, ob vanam gloriam, vel etiam ut furetur, potest nihilominus implere præceptam, etiam per actum ex circumstantiis peccaminosum.—Lib. 1, tr. 2, c. 3, d. 1, p. 31, n. 1, edit. 5.

requires your attendance. This is the decision of twenty very eminent authors cited by Pasqualigio and Gobat."* In conclusion, La Croix adds that, "notwithstanding these criminal intentions, we honour God, to whom the sacrifice is offered by the priest and the people."†

According, therefore, to the wholesome doctrine of these Jesuit fathers, love in the heart is not essential to obedience; because, to perform an act of religion we have only to bend the knee in the presence of God as we would in the presence of an idol; because "the duty of prayer is fulfilled with a voluntarily distracted mind, provided the exterior be *decent* and *composed;*"‡ because we may assist at the holy mysteries through vain glory—with an intention to rob others—or with the mind, heart, and eyes full of impurities and profane love; because, supposing a man appear modest to others, he honours God in "*diverting*"§ himself during the mass with lascivious looks directed to the young females present; because, finally (mark this additional blasphemy), "we may

* Etiam si intentioni audiendi missam adjungatur alia intentio mala, adhuc satisfacis præcepto; *e. g.* si vis audire missam, etiam principaliter ob vanam gloriam, aut simul volens te delectare turpi aspectu puellæ præsentis, satisfacis. Ita autores 20 omnino graves, quos nominatim recenset.—*Pasqualigo*, q. 1313. *Gobat*, n. 206. *La Croix*, tom. li. 1, 3, part 1, p. 371, n. 636.

† Nam per hoc colitur Deus, cui per sacrificantem et assistentes immolatur sacrificium.—*Ibid.*

These are the expressions of F. Bauny.

§ Such is the term used by the Jesuit La Croix.

fulfil," say Father Schilder and Father Humbert de Precipian, since Archbishop of Malines, because "we may fulfil the commandment of Jesus Christ by a sacrilegious communion, as well as by a sacrilegious baptism."*

ON ABSOLUTION OF SINS.

A God whose laws are obeyed by services in which the heart is not concerned, and even by acts of sacrilege and profanity—whom we honour by presenting ourselves before him with a totally depraved heart, provided we be outwardly modest and reserved —a God to whom we may pray as to an idol, namely, without any intention of rendering him homage or adoration, certainly cannot be severe towards sinners, and therefore it must be easy to make our peace with him, when we have committed an offence.

It is true that, formerly, sin was expiated by the tears and sorrows of a broken and contrite heart: but what simpletons were our penitents of those times to imagine that all this melancholy preparation of tears, travail, and rending of the heart was really

* In a Thesis entitled *Synopsis Theologica de Sacramentes Ecclesiæ*, which they defended at Louvain, Aug. 21, 1648, p. 15, col. 1, parag. 31. The following are their words: "*Impletur præceptum Christi; sicut baptismo ita et communione sacrilega.*'

necessary! Everything which they heard concerning the discipline established by the canon of Scripture they understood according to the letter, and never considered what Francolin, the Jesuit, has so judiciously remarked, that "our Cyprians, Augustines, and the rest of the fathers, spoke only as *orators* when they exhorted to virtue, and required a long, painful, and well-tried penitence, animated with love."*

O happy, happy moment, every sinner ought to exclaim, when you, most discerning Francolin, made this admirable discovery. May your name, O incomparable Jesuit, be extolled and celebrated for ever. You have shown us that those canons of the church, and that ancient discipline, together with every idea of former days concerning penitence, were nothing but figures of rhetoric and of human invention. To you we owe the information that they who disseminated those notions were a set of old rhetoricians, whose maxims were intolerably mortifying and severe.

It must be confessed that the Jesuits are much more accommodating than were the ancient fathers. Civil, complaisant, and good-natured creatures, they

* Igitur *oratorie* locutus est aliquando Augustinus. *Oratorie* reliqui patres, dum populum suum.....ad virtutem impellunt, dum necessariam esse dicunt longam, asperam, probatam, et charitate plenam pœnitentiam, dum.....canones laudant.—*Franc.*, tom. ii. disp. 11, p. 321.

are not to be ranked with men who resembled a bramble bush, which must be approached with caution, lest one feel the smart of its thorns. Such is the beautiful idea given of the Society by Father Le Moine. Deputed by the fraternity to compose their eulogy, he says, "No, no, we are not doctors of sadness and sorrow: we are none of your rigid and unsociable guides."* We came into the world to teach what was known to none before our day, and that which in the mouth of any other person would have been incredible—that "crimes are now expiated with much more ardour and cheerfulness than in former ages attended the commission of them; so that many wipe away their spots as promptly as they contract them."†

Let a person, for example, who is in circumstances of temptation to sin, and not disposed to resist the temptation, apply to Father Bauny: this Jesuit will absolve him immediately. "It is," says Father Bauny, "when such a *penitent* has a just reason for exposing himself to the danger of falling into sin, he does not directly or expressly wish for the occasion of the sin, but has respect to his own advantage, that is, to the preservation of his character,

* In his *Manifeste Apologetique*, p. 25.

† Alacrius multo atque ardentius scelera jam expiantur, quam ante solebant committi.....plurimi vix citius maculas contrahunt, quam eluunt.—*The Image of the First Age of the Society of Jesus*, l. 3, c. 9, p. 372.

honour, or possessions, in which he would suffer loss, did he fly from or resist the temptation."*

From this principle it was necessary to deduce its proper conclusion: this Father Bauny has not failed to do. "From what has been said," he observes, "it follows, that absolution may be administered to a woman who receives into her house (or lodges) a man with whom she frequently sins, if she cannot decently send him away, or has any other reason for retaining him, provided she be firmly resolved not to sin with him again."†

This good Jesuit is as indulgent towards men as towards women: he allows absolution to all sorts of sinners, on condition, it is true, that they sincerely repent for their sins, and steadfastly purpose not to fall into them again. Nay, he goes farther than this; for he absolves all those in whose case there appears not the least ground for hope of their amendment. You will say, is it possible? Yes, it is much more than possible; it is an absolute fact. "Ought we," says he, "to give absolution to one who frequently

* Quia cum est justa causa exponendi se peccati periculo, pœnitens nec occasionem vult expresse et actu, nec peccatum ex ea consequens, sed commodum suum, nempe privationem damni in fama, honore, pecuniis, quo bono non frueretur si occasionem perditam omitteret.—*Bauny's Theol. Mor.*, part 1, tract *Quæst. de Pœnit.*, q. 14, p. 94.

† Sequitur ex dictis absolvi posse fœminam, quæ domi suæ virum excipit, cum quo sæpe peccat, si eum honeste inde non potest ejicere, aut causam aliquam habet sum rètinendi: dummodo firmiter proponat se cum eo amplius non peccaturam.—*Ibid.*, q. 15, p. 96.

confesses the same sins, though no hope appear of his reformation?" Then comes his answer. "I reply, in the first place, that notwithstanding the penitent may live in habits of sin, as, for instance, of swearing, or doing anything else that is contrary to the commandments of God, the law of nature, or the precepts of the church, we must not for these reasons refuse absolution to him, supposing he truly repent of the sins he has committed, and be resolved to amend. I answer, secondly, we ought not to refuse or defer absolution, though we see no reason to hope that he will forsake his sins."*

I shall here take no notice of what this same Jesuit has said concerning the mutual sins of men-servants and maid-servants, male and female relations, and of masters and their servant-girls†; but shall now give the words of the Jesuit Father Pirot. "The priest," says he, "ought then to absolve the penitent, though he suppose that the penitent will return to his sin. The theologians" (Jesuits), he adds, "teach, moreover, that though the penitent himself believe that he shall soon repeat his crimes,

* An danda sit absolutio confidenti sæpe eadem peccata sine spe profectus? Dico primo: esti pœnitens consuetudinem peccandi habeat, jurandive, aut aliud simile quid amitendi contra legem Dei, naturæ aut ecclesiæ; non est tamen ei neganda absolutio, si vere eorum admissorum pœnitet, et emendandi sui propositum habet.

Dico secundo: nec negandam, nec differendam ei, etsi emendationis futuræ spes nulla appareat.—*Bauny, Ibid*, ques. 2.

† In his *Summary of Sins*, chap. 46, p. 715, quest. 5, 6th edit.

he is, nevertheless, in a state for receiving absolution, provided his sin be displeasing to him at the time of confession."*

Tambourin advances yet farther. Addressing himself to the confessors, he says, "When you perceive that your penitent is strongly attached to any sin, you should take care not to require regret for that sin in particular; for it is to be feared that he would not truly detest it while reflecting on the commission of it. You must be satisfied with his general hatred of it, in which he will find little or no difficulty."†

It is a constant maxim with the Jesuits, that absolution of habitual sinners ought not to be delayed. Father Archdekin says, "The absolution of habitual sinners must not ordinarily be deferred till they be actually reformed: this is taught by so many of the theologians, that I could produce thirty, belonging to the different schools, whom I have carefully read and examined, and whose authority is indisputable. Amongst these are the Fathers Suarez, De Lugo, Dicastillus, &c."‡

* *Apology for the Casuists*, p. 162.

† In his *Easy Method of Confession*, l. i., ch. 1, parag. 2, p. 5, n. 5.

‡ Cæterum ut supra dixi, non esse lege ordinaria differendam consuetudinariis absolutionem, donec actu vitam emendent, docent tanto numero theologi, ut ex ipsis possim omnino triginta recte lectos et examinatos ex variis scholis proferre, inter quos est Suarez, Lugo, Dicastillo, etc.—Archdekin, in his *Theology, or Resolutions Polem.*, part 3, tr. 1, quest. 15, p. 140.

Father De Reulx, another Jesuit, remarks, that "to withhold absolution from sinners till they shall be completely cured of their wicked habits, is not the conduct of a vicar of the good Shepherd; on the contrary, this would be to plunge them into despair."*

Father Maës, also a Jesuit, decides the point in a manner equally explicit: "Absolution," he tells us, "is not to be refused or deferred precisely because a sinner may not wish to avoid temptation to some mortal sin, when he has a good reason for not avoiding it." And as this Father is a man for principles, take the two following, on which he founds his decision: "The maxim," he says, "that a relapse into sin indicates there was no sincere penitence, and that also which affirms that sinners are not suddenly converted, are destitute of the appearance of truth."†

The same sentiment is maintained by Father Archdekin, who observes, "We must pay no attention to the novel method of a handful of confessors who

* Consuetudinariis absolutionem negare.....donec consuetudinem penitus exuerint, non est boni et mansueti pastoris vicarium agere; sed pro salutis anchora desperationis laqueum objicere.—In a *Thesis* defended at Louvain, July 28, 1688, pos. 40.

† Nec adeo præcise alicui neganda aut differenda est absolutio, quod proximam peccandi graviter occasionem nolit deserere, quando justam non deserendi habet rationem.....Veri speciem non habet illud, relapsum non vere prius pœnituisse; nec illud, peccatores subito non converti.—In a *Thesis* defended at Louvain in the month of July, 1693, pos. 36.

condemn this practice," (the practice of giving immediate absolution,) "a method founded on the false pretext that sincere conversion is not usually sudden."*

Some will here be inclined to ask, What, then, are the dispositions required by the Jesuits in approaching the holy table? But let none expect to find them so rigorous in this as the Romans were in regard to their vestals. It was required of these priestesses while they were engaged in the service of the goddess Vesta, and attending to the fire which was to be kept perpetually burning on her altars, to preserve themselves pure, under pain of being buried alive†. It is true, indeed, that such purity and strictness were proper only for the times of heathenism. For our part, we live in a more agreeable age, and are under no sort of necessity to be so particular, especially since Father Le Moine came "to render voluptuousness *the honour it deserves*, and restore it to its proper place in the discipline of the church."‡

For proof, let us ask Azor, the Jesuit, whether a criminal impurity should prevent a priest who has

* Nec audienda est contra hanc praxim methodus nova (Jesuit Latin).

† By opposing the conduct of the Romans to the laxity of the Jesuits, I would not be supposed to insinuate that the same severity ought to be observed in reference to the penitents of the latter that the Romans used with regard to their vestals.

‡ *Easy Devotion*, p. 202.

been guilty of it from offering the holy sacrifice on the same day. He will answer, "Formerly, perhaps, the Church might forbid this; but notwithstanding the prohibition, which to me appears never to have been established, it is much nearer the truth to say, as other authors have done, that it is allowable for such a priest to offer the sacrifice on the same day, provided he have confessed with the requisite grief."*

The reason assigned deserves remark: "It is," says he, "that there is no other mortal sin whatever (supposing it to have been expiated by a suitable sorrow and confession), that would prevent his celebrating the holy mysteries."†

Mascharenhas, another Jesuit, decides in a similar strain, that "he who has defiled himself by any criminal impurity, may, without sinning, communicate the same day, after confessing." "It is true," he adds, "that the difficulty is increased in case of fornication, adultery, or the sin against nature."‡

"I say, in reference to these impurities," he rejoins,

* Sed quidquid sit de hujusmodi præcepto ecclesiæ, quod mihi non videtur impositum fuisse, *multo verius est* quod alii docuerunt, fas esse sacerdoti eo die sacrificare, præmissa confessione cum legitimo cordis dolore.—*Inst. Mor.*, tom. i., l. 19, c. 34, p. 1307.

† Nullum quippe aliud quodlibet lethale peccatum, modo illud sit dolore legitimo et confessione explatum sacrificium impedit.—*Ibid.*

‡ Sive habeatur per fornicationem, sive per adulterum, sive per peccatum contra naturam, vel quecunque alio modo.—*Tr. de Sacram.*, tr. 4, *de Eucharist.*, disp. 5, cap. 7, p. 239.

"that he who has committed any of them may communicate on the same day, after making confession, with the requisite feelings of grief; and in doing so he will not sin mortally, nor even venially. Such," he tells us, "is the decision of Sylvester, Navarre, and our Fathers Ægidius, Hurtadus, Azor, Suarez, Laiman, Henriquez, Facundez, Sancius, and many others,"* *all vicars of the good Shepherd.*

But it will probably be asked, whether, if a fornicator have made a vow not to communicate the same day, he ought not to keep his vow. "No," says Mascharenhas, whom nothing can embarrass, "he who has resolved not to receive the sacrament on the day of his committing an act of fornication, which he has confessed with true sorrow, has formed a resolution not valid, and which should stand for nothing; for such a resolution or vow is an obstacle to a thing of greater consequence, for which reason it cannot be a true vow, nor ought it to be regarded as binding him who has made it."†

* Dico, qui habuit voluntariam et mortaliter peccaminosam pollutionem, sive cum complice, sive sine illo, si habeat debitum illius dolorem, præmissa confessione, poterit in eadem die communicare, quin in hoc peccet mortaliter, nec etiam venialiter. Ita Sylvester, Navarrus, Pater Ægidus, P. Hurtadus, P. Azor, P. Suarez, P. Laymanus, P. Henriquez, P. Facundez, et cum multis Johannes Sancius.—*Tr. de Sacram.*, tr. 4, *de Eucharistia.*

† Et hinc infero non esse validum votum factum non suscipiendi Eucharistiam die habitæ copulæ fornicariæ, etiam præmissa confessione cum vero dolore; nam tale votum est impeditivum majoris boni; ideo non potest habere rationem voti, nec vim obligandi.—*Ibid.*

In order to establish his maxim, and crowd the table of Jesus Christ with the vilest characters, this Jesuit asserts that it is the duty of confessors to advise sinners to communicate the very day on which they may have indulged themselves in the most criminal impurities. "Yes," says he, "it is necessary to exhort this class of sinners to communicate, provided they have only prepared themselves by confession."*

What words, we may ask, could be more opposed to the caution of our Redeemer, *not to cast that which is holy to the dogs?* Such, nevertheless, is the doctrine which Mascharenhas has dedicated to the Virgin, by dedicating his book to her. He even declares that he has there inserted nothing which he did not learn from her as his teacher, and that it was by her inspiration he composed his work; a declaration that would have been very true had he only substituted *Venus* in place of the *Virgin*.

Father de Moya, a Spanish Jesuit, after transcribing the above cited passages from Mascharenhas, expresses himself on this point in the following terms:—"Our very learned Father Francois Suarez, who is himself alone worth a thousand of us, contends also for our sentiment:" his words are, "Strictly speaking, there can be nothing improper in communicating

* Imo potius consulendum quod communicent dummodo sint per confessionem rite dispositi.—Tr. *de Sacrum.*, tr. 4, *de Eucharistia.*

soon after we have committed a mortal sin, supposing a due confession be first made." We will conclude this subject with an extract of a letter from *Mon. Charles Brulart, de Genlis, Archbishop of Ambrun, to Mon. de Arlai, Archbishop of Paris* *.

"The pulpit of my Metropolitan Church," says this illustrious prelate, "having been, for more than a century, appropriated to their college," (the college of the Jesuits,) "they have preached before me that the sacrament of penitence, with a fear of punishment entirely unaccompanied with any emotion of the love of God is sufficient for our justification. They have taught that, supposing a man to be guilty of all the sins of the damned in hell, yet if he make confession, with a promise to his confessor of amendment, he may communicate immediately."

ON LOVING OUR NEIGHBOUR,

AND OUR DUTY TOWARDS HIM.

In the preceding chapter, the Jesuits have taught us, that all our duties and obligations to God may be comprised in a few external performances, and

* Dated June 28, 1696.

that to fear without loving him is sufficient. They have even instructed us to offend and insult him, rather than to render to him that holy obedience and just homage which he has a right to expect from us. Hence, as they evince so little respect for the Almighty, we need not wonder that they are sparing in their tender regard for mankind.

When a certain lawyer once asked Jesus Christ what he must do to inherit eternal life, Jesus Christ referred him to the law: What does that say? The man replied, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, &c., and thy neighbour as thyself;"* to which the Saviour rejoined, "This do, and thou shalt live." But no, say the Jesuits, this is not necessary. You shall live though you do no such thing. Thus it was that the devil, concealed under the form of the most beautiful of animals, formerly spoke. "*Ye shall not surely die,*" said he to our first parents, though you eat of the fruit which under pain of death has been forbidden.† So have the Jesuits ever taught: do not imagine that you shall die unless you love God with all your heart, with all your soul, and with all your strength; be satisfied with not hating him,—that is the import of the injunction.

Be content also, they add, not to hate your neighbour, for this is all that Jesus Christ intends by

* Luke x. 25—28. † Gen. iii. 4.

the words, my commandment is, that you love one another*. Precisely the same is the meaning of St. Paul, when he remarks, he who loves his brother has fulfilled the law†. Nothing more is to be understood than that a man who does not hate his brother has obeyed the precept which includes all the law and the prophets‡.

But some one not belonging to the Society of Jesus will remark, this interpretation is absolutely false, for Jesus Christ, who enjoins us to love our neighbour, has given us clearly to understand that he means more than not to hate him. The commandment, says he, that I give you, is, that you love one another as I have loved you§. Now the Saviour did not think it enough not to hate us, but he loved us so as to die for us, and that when we were enemies to him by wicked works‖. Whence St. John concludes that we ought also to lay down our lives for the brethren¶.

But the Jesuits reply, "*these are hard sayings*, and we cannot hear them." A reply not put into their mouths by their enemies, for the purpose of rendering them odious, but furnished by their own conduct; for they have ventured to revise and improve the gospel, and have taught, on the subject of loving one another, a doctrine contrary to that of Jesus Christ

* John xv. 17. † Rom. xiii. 8. ‡ Matt. xxii. 40.
§ John xv. 12. ‖ Rom. v. 10. ¶ 2 John iii. 16.

To be convinced of this, let us attend to Father Tambourin.

"As it is certain," he says, "that we are required to love our neighbour, agreeably to the words of Christ, by St. Matthew, *thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself*, so to me it appears equally certain that we are not bound to love him by any internal act directed expressly to him."* Now we should have supposed, from a first view of the words, *thou shalt love thy neighbour*, that we were required to love him really; but such a conclusion would be entirely wrong. The words of the gospel must be retained, but the sense of them reversed. Thou shalt love, that is to say, thou shalt *not* love *inwardly*. This is exactly in the style of "a *Just excommunication*," when an unjust excommunication is intended; and of a "*real duty*," put for one that is imaginary and false†.

Father Lamy, as deeply read in the Scriptures as Father Tambourin, has an argument not less refined than the above. "We are not bound by this precept," he observes, "to love our neighbour otherwise, or more than ourselves. Now as it is not required of us to love ourselves in a sense implying any internal

* Ita mihi certum videtur non adesse obligationem eum diligendi per aliquem actum internum expresse tendentem in ipsum proximum.—*Tambourin's Explic. of the Decalogue*, part 2, L. 5, ch. 1, p. 1, col. 1, n. 1.

† *Instr. Past.* des. 40, p. 115.

act, consequently we are not enjoined to love our neighbour in any such manner."* He also adds (and the remark is truly excellent), "If it were our duty to love our neighbour thus, a large proportion of us should stand condemned for not having exercised this internal act of charity towards all men; a supposition which would be improbable and absurd."† Thus we see, that as the number of the chosen is *very great*‡, the way which leads to life *very broad*, and *many* there be that find it§, it follows that we are under no obligation to love one another with an inward feeling or emotion.

Who would have imagined that a doctrine so impious and ridiculous would have found any partisans, except among the Jesuits, by whom it was invented? It is, however, a fact, that Sieur le Roux, Professor of Theology at Rheims, following the steps of Tambourin and Lamy, has unblushingly asserted in the face of the world, and dictated to his pupils, "that St. John in declaring that *he who loves not his brother abideth in death*, does not speak of any

* Vi hujus præcepti non tenemur diligere proximum aliter vel plus quam nos ipsos. Atqui nos ipsos non tenemur diligere actu interno charitatis; ergo nec proximum.—*Lamy's Theological Works*, tom. 4, disp. 28, sect. 1, n. 13, page 377.

† Multi damnarentur ex eo quod hujusmodi actum internum charitatis erga omnes homines non elicuerint, quod est argumentum ab absurdo et improbabili.—*Theological Works*, tom. 4, disp. 28.

‡ Matt. xx. 16. § Matt. vii. 13, 14.

formal and explicit love, but merely intends by these words to exclude the hating of our neighbour."*

As the Jesuits have thus enfeebled, or rather annihilated, the precept which requires us to love our neighbour, it will not excite our astonishment to learn, that it is lawful to desire his death. Father Bauny tells us, we may innocently *wish evil* to our neighbour when we have a good reason for it; adding, as an example, that "Bonacina exempts from all blame a mother, who wishes the death of her daughters because they are not beautiful, or that, not being rich, she has no prospect of their marrying so advantageously as she could desire."†

Tambourin, equally accommodating, allows a son to wish the death of his father, that he may the sooner succeed to the enjoyment of the father's property. "If," says he, "you desire conditionally the death of your father, we find no difficulty in replying that it is lawful for you to do so: for supposing a man to say to himself, If my father were dead his possessions would become mine, then the subject of his gladness is not the father's death, but succession

* Testimonium Joannis, *Qui non diligit manet in morte.* De fraterna charitate formali et explicita non agit—Vult solum excludi odium proximi.—*Le Roux*, in his *Treatise on Penitence.*

† Quod ob deformitatem aut inopiam nequeat juxta animi sui desiderium eas nuptui tradere.—*Bauny's Summary of Sins*, ch. 7, p. 77, conclus. 9.

to his estates."* Such is the first lesson of this Jesuit to instruct children how they may very decently desire the death of their parents. The second is like unto it. "I desire the death of my father, not for evil to him, but for good to myself, or because my own advantage will be the result, seeing that by his death I shall become possessed of the hereditary succession."†

Bauny and Tambourin tell us, that it is allowable to wish evil to our neighbour. That a son may desire the death of his father, and an inferior that of his superior or his prelate, in order to succeed to the property or charge of the deceased, because the estate of a father and the honours of an episcopacy are things we may very innocently wish for, provided we rejoice not in the evil happening to the persons in question, but on account of the benefit we shall derive from their death‡.

* Si desideres sub conditione, facilis item responsio licite posse. Si quis enim hunc actum eliciat: si meus pater moreretur, ego hæreditate potirer, et gauderet tunc ille non de patris morte, sed de hæreditate.—*Tamb. Explic. of the Decalogue*, part 2, L. 5, ch. 1, parag. 3, n. 30.

† Cupio mortem patris, non ut malum patris est, sed ut bonum meum, seu ut causa mei boni; nimirum quia ex illius morte ego ejus hæreditatem adibo.—*Ibid.*

‡ An possit subditus mortem cupere sui prælati, ut prælaturæ ipse succedat——Si solum desideres, vel cum gaudio excipias ejus modi effectus, hæreditatem, prælaturam, facilis est responsio. Licite enim hæc optas vel amplecteris, quia non gaudes de alterius malo, sed proprio bono.—*Ibid.*, p. 2, l. 5, ch. 3, parag. 3, n. 32 and 33.

But these cruel and murderous theologians do not stop here. They allow children to make an attempt on the life of their parents, and, in certain cases, actually to kill them: "Yes," says Dicastillus the Jesuit, "a son, on being unjustly attacked by his father, may, in his own defence, lawfully murder the father, as may also servants their masters, vassals their lords, and monks their abbots and superiors."*

Lessius is equally explicit on this article. "Ecclesiastics and monks," he informs us, "are at liberty, as well as the laity, to kill in defence of their own lives. And of this liberty," he says, "they may avail themselves against any one, not excepting even their superiors: as a monk, for instance, against his abbot, a son against his father, a servant against his master, and a vassal against his lord or his king."† So that, according to this sanguinary doctrine, an ecclesiastic, a monk, a soldier, a son, or a subject, who may happen to perceive his bishop, abbot, captain, father, lord, or king, taking up a sword to strike him, would be fully justified in killing the assailant, from fear of losing his own life. But, as if enough had not been

* Colligitur ulterius licitum esse filiis contra parentes, servis contra dominos, vassalis contra principes vi vim repellere quando actu invaduntur injuste—idemque de monachis aut subditis contra abbates et superiores.—*Discast.* L. 2, *de Just.* tr. 1, disp. 10, dub. 3, num. 30.

† Quare etiam clericis et monachis hoc concessum sicut et laicis, idque contra quoscunque, etiam contra superiores, ut monacho contra abbatem, filio contra parentem, servo contra dominum, vassalo contra principem.—*Lessius, De Just. et Jur.*, l. 2, c. 9, d. 8, d. 41, p. 84.

said, this same Lessius adds, that "in whatever office a man may be engaged, as, supposing for example, a priest to be attacked while at the altar repeating the mass, he may defend himself, and even slay, if it should be necessary, the person who attacks him, and afterwards continue the mass."* As if he had only cleansed his hands afresh in the blood of his neighbour, and, by so doing, had rendered himself more worthy of drinking that of Jesus Christ, shed for the salvation of his enemies.

The celebrated Molina grants a still greater liberty to spill the blood of others, and take away the life of every aggressor. He tells us, "It is lawful to employ every sort of means, and every kind of arms, when requisite to our own defence."† That is to say, should a person seek our life, we should do right in causing his death, either by the dagger, by fire, by poison, or any other means which might appear to us most convenient. Such is the doctrine of our modern apostles. But O how different from that of the ancient apostles of our Lord, who forbid us to *avenge ourselves by rendering evil for evil;* who speak only of *blessing our persecutors*, and make it our duty even *to*

* Et in quocunque officio, sit quis occupatus, ut si celebret et invadatur, potest se tueri et occidere, invasorem, si necesse sit, et postea sacrum continuare.—*Less. De Just. et Jur.*

† Fas est quacunque via et ratione, et quibuscunque armis id totum efficere quod ad totam deffensionem fuerit necessarium.—*Molina, De Just. et Jur.*, tom. 4, tr. 3, disp. 2, n. 5, p. 1757.

lay down our life, should it be necessary, for the brethren*. To men who style themselves "*warlike champions*," these sentiments of love and compassion towards our neighbours are by no means agreeable. Their proper business, and that in which their disciples are instructed, is, to kill, burn, poison, or massacre fathers, mothers, princes, kings, or anybody else by whom their own lives may be threatened. Well! since they are so perfectly skilled in the art of self-defence, and can teach so admirably the manner of handling instruments of death, let them in future fix over the doors of their seminaries the representation of a human hand grasping a sword.

But we have not yet seen the whole. Not content with teaching men to murder others when their own lives may be in danger, these Jesuits give the same lesson in regard to persons who may wish to possess themselves of our property. "It appears," says Lessius, "that this reason for killing is of equal force in case of a person's endeavouring to deprive us of our substance; because he would take away that which is necessary and ornamental to life."† He maintains, moreover, that "it is lawful to murder a person who may unjustly prevent our creditors from

* See Rom. xii. 14, 17, 19, and 1 John iii. 16.

† Et eadem videtur esse ratio in invasione fortunarum. Nam fortunæ unt necessarium vitæ instrumentum, subsidium et ornamentum.—*Less. De Just. et Jur.*, l. 2, c. 9, d. 8, n. 49.

paying what they owe us."* Let every man, therefore, take care how he lays his hands on the revenues of the Jesuits, or deprives them of the means of living in easy circumstances. For as the ornaments of life are more to them than the life itself of him who may wish to take those ornaments away, even supposing him to be a king, they would immediately put him to death without the least respect to the sacredness of his person or situation. This is really a circumstance which demands more attention than some would imagine, and especially from princes, who by taxes or imposts may happen to put it out of the power of these Jesuits to live sumptuously.

Molina asserts, that he "should not dare to condemn as guilty of any sin, a man who had killed another for striving to take from him anything of the value of a crown or less."† Whence *Escobar has established it as a general rule*, that "it is lawful to murder a man for the value of a crown."‡ But not to multiply remarks on this point, I proceed to the famous question, whether it be lawful to murder persons who attack our honour or character? And here the logic of the Jesuits triumphs. "Ecclesiastics and monks," says Escobar, "are allowed to

* Si impedis inique meos creditores, ne mihi satisfaciant.—*Less De Just. et Jur.*, d. 12, n. 78.

† Unius aurei, vel minoris adhuc valoris.—*Molina*, tom. 4, tr. 3, disp. 16, d. 6.

‡ Escob., tr. 1, ex. 7, n. 44.

murder a thief, when it may be necessary for the preservation of their property." This is the principle. "Therefore it is also lawful for them to defend their honour by murdering him who attacks it."* This is the conclusion.

Lamy the Jesuit also puts a sword into the hands of monks and ecclesiastics, to shed the blood of those who may happen to speak disrespectfully of them. His words are, "A monk, or an ecclesiastic, is permitted to take away the life of a calumniator who threatens to accuse him, or his order, before the public of some great crime, supposing he has no other means of preventing the publication; and no other means he appears to have, when the slanderer is about to assert his calumnies before persons of consideration, unless he be immediately dispatched."†

"It is lawful," Longuet the Jesuit likewise informs us, "to take away the life of another in defence of our honour, or for the purpose of repelling anything that might wound our reputation."‡ There

* Licitum est clericis et religiosis, in tutelam suarum facultatum furem occidere, si alius modus non suppetat; ergo et in tutelam honoris.—*Escob.*, tr. 1, ex. 7, ch. 3, n. 54.

† Unde licebit clerico vel religioso, calumniatorem gravia crimina de se vel sua religione spargere minantem, occidere, quando alius defendendi modus non suppetit; uti suppetere non videtur, si calumniator sit paratus ea vel ipsi religioso, vel ejus religioni publice coram gravissimis viris impingere.—*Lamy*, tom. 5, disp. 36, num. 118.

‡ Ad tuendum honorem suum et propulsandum infamium licet occidere.—*Lonquet*, in his *Dictum on the 5th precept of the Decal.*, q. 4, rep. 2.

is nothing in any of these dogmas capable of causing the *Society* to blush. The more they partake of the sanguinary and barbarous, the greater is the effrontery with which the Jesuits defend them; like the infamous females of whom Juvenal remarks, that "in proportion to the abominable nature of their undertaking, is their resolution and audacity in executing it."* Such is the true character of the Jesuits.

ON THE NATURE OF OATHS.

In these few pages I purpose to show, without comment and from their own authorities, how the Jesuits instruct men in the art of deceiving by false promises, and teach them how to swear that a thing is false when they know it to be true. The first example which I shall bring forward is given by Filliucius, a Jesuit professor and casuist in the College of Rome.

"He," says this Jesuit, "who has outwardly promised anything, but without *an intention of promising it*, on being asked whether he did make such a promise, may reply, *No;* meaning within himself that he made no promise which implied any obliga-

* Sat. 6.

tion to keep it." Nay, he may go much farther than this, for "he may confirm his denial by an oath; because, otherwise he would be compelled to pay what he does not owe."*

Tambourin, another Jesuit, dispenses even with the word and oath of persons who are not *quite certain* that they intended to keep them: "Though you may be aware," says he, "that you have made a vow or an oath, it is, in my judgment, probable that you are under no obligation to observe either one or the other, supposing you are in any *doubt* as to your intending to bind yourself by that oath or vow."†

But Valentia, another authority of the Romish Church, goes farther still. It is his opinion that "though a man have deliberately intended to bind himself, he is not bound, unless he had an intention of *executing* what he promised." The reason assigned is curious: "It is," says he, "that the vow" (he should have said the oath also) "remains null so long as the man is *unwilling* to execute it."‡

* Afferri solent exempla aliqua, ut primo ejus qui promisit exterius, et absque intentione promittendi.....Si enim interrogetur an promiserit, negare potest, intelligendo se non promisisse promissione obligante, et sic etiam jurare alioquin urgeretur solvere quod non debet.—*Filliuc.*, tom. ii., tr. 35, n. 323.

† Si certo vovisti vel jurasti, at ambigis an animum te obligandi habueris per illa verba, seu per illud juramentum.....Puto non esse improbabile te nequaquam obligari.—*Tamb. in Decal.*, l. i., ch. 3, parag. 7, n. 6.

‡ Scio Valentium, Q. 2, d. 6, q. 6, p. 1, Censere: si promittat animo quidem te obligandi.....sed cum voluntate rem promissam

An oath of subtle invention, by which we are to cause others to believe what is utterly false without any danger of perjuring ourself (according to Jesuit morality), is given by Sanchez. It is, "to say when we take an oath, whether by choice or compulsion, *uro*, which signifies, I burn; instead of saying, juro, I swear."*

"A man may swear," says Sanchez, this adept in equivocation, "that he has not done a thing, though in fact he has done it, meaning, in himself, that he did not do it on a certain day, or before he was born; or understanding any other circumstance of a similar nature. And this," he adds, "will be found exceedingly convenient on numerous occasions."†

"There is neither sin nor perjury," says Filliucius, "in availing ourselves of an equivocation, when the purpose to be served is in itself good."‡

nullatenus exequendi, tunc nullam exurgere obligationem, quin si nullam habes voluntatem rei faciendæ, nullum emittis votum.—*Tamb. in Decal.*, l. 3, c. 12, parag. 1, n. 4.

* Similiter non esset plusquam veniale mendacium dicere *Uro*, ablata *J*, cum vere nil urat.—*Sanch.*, l. 3, c. 6, n. 37.

† Si quis....Juret se non fecisse aliquid, quod re verâ facit, intelligendo intra se aliquid aliud quod non fecit, vel aliam diem ab ea in qua fecit....vel quodvis aliud additum verum, re verâ non mentitur, nec est perjurus....Immo hoc est utilissimum ad tegenda multa Causa vero, Justa utendi his amphibologiis est, quoties id necessarium, aut utile est ad salutem corporis, honorem, res familiares tuenda....Item licebit respondere se non occidisse Petrum, intelligendo alium ejusdem nominis, vel etiam eundemmet, intelligendo antequam nasceretur.—*Ibid.*, n. 15, 19.

‡ Secundo quæro an sit perjurium vel peccatum uti amphilogiâ

Stoz, another Papal authority, asserts that "a person who has committed a crime secretly, on being interrogated, may deny it, under the plea to himself that he has not committed a public crime."* Also, "a culprit on being examined in a court of justice, respecting a crime which cannot be fully proved against him, unless he confess it, may deny that he is guilty, if a confession would risk the loss of his life, his liberty, or his possessions."† "Finally," he adds, "in these and all similar cases the oath may be employed, should reason and the nature of the thing require it, provided it be accompanied with a good and convenient equivocation, for thus Lessius has decided."‡

Casnedi (*a Jesuit of Lisbon, and Regulator of the Inquisitions of Spain and Portugal*), in a work called *Crisis Theologica*, printed at Lisbon, in the year 1719, with the approbation of the theologians of the

ex honesta causa? Respondeo et dico primo, talem non esse perjurum.—*Filliuc.*, tom. 2, tr. 25, num. 323.

* Potest quis suum crimen occultum negare, subintelligendo ut publicum.—In his book entitled, *The Tribunal of Penitence*, l. 1, part 3, p. 173, num. 220.

† Reus a judice interrogatus de delicto quod sine propria illius confessione plene probari nequit, potest illud negare, si ex illa confessione sit incursurus periculum vitæ: Quod extenditur etiam ad quocunque aliud grave malum, *e. g.* exilium, bonorum omnium amissionem.—*Stoz. Ibid.*

‡ Possunt hæc omnia, si res ita ferat, et ratio postulet, etiam Juramento confirmari: modo debita et congrua æquivocatio adhibeatur Lessius.—*Stoz. Ibid.*

Society, and of Father de Sousas, Provincial of Portugal, says,—

"I assert that a culprit, on being examined in a court of justice with a view to his being punished, is not obliged under pain of sinning to acknowledge his crime, if by a mental restriction, or a merely verbal equivocation, he can hide or dissemble it, so as to escape a considerable punishment; such as the galleys, a long imprisonment, the confiscation of his goods, great infamy, &c. He may even dissemble or conceal his crime by recourse to the oath, in taking of which he is at liberty to make some mental reservation, or to employ a verbiage purely material."*

I shall conclude this subject with a decision of Filliucius, on engaging others to swear falsely for us.

"It is a thing perfectly innocent in itself to request another to swear for us, though we are aware that in doing so he will perjure himself; provided it may serve our interest, or that we have just reason to avail ourselves of such a method on account of the

* Dico quod reus de commisso a se crimine interrogatus a judice juridice criminaliter, sive ut puniatur; si occultando restrictione sensibili, aut locutione pure materiali aut æquivoca, suum crimen, spem habeat evadendi pœnam capitalem, ut sunt magna infamia, triremes, carcer durissimus, bonorum omnium confiscatio, et similes pœnæ æquivalentes morti, non teneatur sub culpa, reatum suum candide fateri; quin licite possit suum crimen etiam jurejurando occultare, sive restrictione sensibili, sive locutione pure materiali.—*Casnedi*, tom. v., disp. 9, n. 316, p. 76, col. 1.

pressure of our affairs, or from a hope of gaining by it; otherwise it would be a breach of charity to expose a neighbour by engaging him on such an occasion."* And, notwithstanding, this champion of the Jesuits has the effrontery to add, "that it would be no violation of charity; for no man is obliged to prevent another's sin, by means of loss or damage to himself."†

From these specimens let any man judge of what the Jesuits are capable, when the honour or welfare of their Society is in question. What chiefly demands our attention is the tendency of this doctrine to destroy the force and meaning of oaths, by rendering them common, and multiplying occasions of perjury. Let it once be regarded as lawful to swear that we have not done a thing, though we know that we have done it, meaning that we did it not on a certain day, or before we were born; and how many will soon learn to trifle with an oath, and without scruple perjure themselves, whenever it may in any measure serve their interest!

* Non esse intrinsece malum petere juramentum ab eo quem scimus pejeraturum, dum modo serventur aliquæ conditiones.

Ut si aliqua justa causa id petendi, necessitas videlicit, vel utilitas; alioqui esset contra charitatem proximum constituere in tali occasione.—*Filliuc.*, tom. 2, tr. 21, c. 11, n. 346.

† Nec propterea est contra charitatem, quia hoc non obligat ad itandum peccatum alterius cum proprio damno.—*Ibid.*

ON SENSUALITY.

"WHAT," inquires Father Filliucius, "is the judgment we ought to form of persons who listen to filthy discourse? I reply, that in itself it is a thing purely indifferent."* "The same," he adds, "may be said of reading indecent books, the contents of which are chiefly amorous."

The language of Filliucius on these particulars is too indecent for translation, I shall therefore give them in their original Latin: "Partes quæcunque corporis propriæ vel alienæ, quæ communiter et honeste in humano convictu ostendi solent, ut brachia, pectus, crura, absque peccato ullo aspici possunt."†

But this Jesuit does not stop here; for he adds, "Totum etiam corpus coopertis pudendis in balneo vel flumine, si necessitas vel utilitas aliqua, vel etiam commoditas, vel delectatio ob sanitatem intercedat, absque ullo peccato aspici potest."‡

In these liberties Escobar can see nothing that is improper. "Enimvero," says he, "si esset aspectus partium quas pudor velat, vel ipsius concubitus, speculative quidem non damnarem."§

"An amplexus nudi cum nudo.....possit etiam

* Quæres de auditione rerum turpium? Respondeo.....ex se esse rem indifferentem.—*Filliuc.*, tom. ii., c. 10, n. 212.

† Filliuc., tom. ii., c. 10, n. 217. ‡ *Ibid.*

§ Escob., tr. 1, ex. 8, c. 1, n. 4, p. 135.

esse inter tactus causa benevolentiæ?"* asks Filliucius. If it be possible to conceive anything more revolting than this question, it must be the answer that he subjoins: "Respondeo, si speculative loquamur, etiam illa est res indifferens."† This is really very edifying, and admirably calculated to reform the morals of the public.

We will produce another question from Escobar, relative to persons under a matrimonial engagement to each other, which, with the reply, he has taken from Sanchez, the most filthy and licentious of all the Jesuits.

"Sanchez citatus ait licere oscula et tactus externos, etiamsi secutura pollutio prævideatur, dummodo adsit justa causa sponso, scilicet ad vitandam inurbanitatem, et austeritatis notam."‡

And yet, if you ask Lessius how it is that his colleagues, Escobar and Sanchez, permit persons in those circumstances to use such liberties, he will give you the following reason: "Sponsis conceditur quia est signum copulæ futuræ, in quam ratione matrimonii consentire quodammodo possunt."§ And when they are married they may give an unbridled licence to their passion, like the brute that has nothing but voluptuousness for its guide.

* Filliuc., tr. 30, c. 9, p. 174. † *Ibid.*
‡ Escob., tr. 1, ex. 8, n. 74.
§ Less. *De Just.*, l. 4, c. 3, d. 8, n. 59.

"Peccantne venialiter," says Escobar, "cosuntes captandæ voluptatis causa? Negative respondet Sanchez." Disp. 29, ques. 3*. And with respect to aged people whose marriage may be unfruitful, Tambourin says: "Senes quamvis credant non amplius filios generaturos, copula uti queunt."† What follows is too gross to be given, even in Latin.

The law of God says, "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's wife;" while our Saviour Jesus Christ declares that "whosoever shall look on a woman to lust after her, is an adulterer in his heart."‡ But the Jesuits, in effect, annihilate the words of the law and of Jesus Christ. They tell you *it is an article of the Christian faith that there is nothing sinful or wrong in concupiscence; and that the Almighty may have been the author of it*§. Thus they invest the desires of concupiscence with the character of good and innocent, and allow that which the law and Jesus Christ forbid. Let us hear Sanchez: "Nec peccaret desiderans accedere ad aliquam, si esset sua uxor. Nec religiosus aut conjugatus desiderans uxorem ducere, si ille a voto, ille a conjugio liber esset."‖ Consequently neither a nun nor a married

* Escob., tr. 7, ex. 9, p. 883, n. 164.

† Tamb., l. 7, decal. c. 3, par. 5, n. 45. ‡ Matt. v. 28.

§ Potuit igitur ab initio creari homo concupiscentiæ obnoxius, sicut jam nascitur.—De Reulx, in his *Thesis* on the Epistle to the Romans, maintained at the College of the Jesuits at Louvain, April 19, 1684, on the first verse of the 8th chapter.

‖ Sanch., lib. 1, Mor. ch. 2, p. 9, col. 2, n. 34.

woman commits any sin in forming such desires respecting any man, provided only that they say within themselves, the one, If I were free from my vow, and the other, If I were disengaged from the marriage bond, which restricts me to my husband.

The reason which this infamous writer assigns is, "Delectatio voluntatis de objecto conditionali, quod seclusa conditione esset peccatum mortale, nunc autem ea posita, non est illicita: ut gaudium voluntatis de concubitu, si esset uxor."*

Filliucius also grants the same liberty to persons dedicated to God by the most solemn vows. "Yes," says this Roman casuist, "when we add to an action a condition which divests it of everything sinful, as, for instance, if a person say, I would eat meat in Lent if it were not forbidden: cognoscerem Titiam si esset uxor; with such a supposition the desire is not unlawful, because, as Layman remarks, 'Concubitus cum muliere apprehensa sub conditione et statu conjugii non est malum, sed bonum objectum.'"† I make no comment upon these extracts, but leave the reader to draw his own conclusions.

* Sanch., lib. 1, Mor. ch. 2, p. 9, col. 2, n. 34.

† Quando conditio tollit malitiam ab actu, ut comederem carnes in quadragesima, nisi esset vetitum: Tunc potest absque peccato desiderari res ex objecto mortalis.—*Filliuc.*, Mor. Ques., tom. 2, tr. 21, c. 8, n. 296, p. 27; *Layman*, lib. 1, tr. 3, c. 6, n. 12, p. 41.

ON ASSISTING OTHERS IN PRACTICES OF LEWDNESS AND DEBAUCHERY.

THE Jesuits having spoken in terms so favourable to voluptuousness, it is but natural that they should advocate the cause of the profligate. The one leads directly to the other. Our attention is now directed to the instructions these holy fathers give to servants to obey their masters, when called upon to assist them in their debauchery.

The Jesuit Gaspar Hurtado says, "that a servant, in compliance with the wishes of his master, may watch a female on her way home, to discover where she resides. That he may carry her little presents; and also accompany his master, either for the maintenance of his dignity, or to take care of him, when he visits her. That he may, if necessary, assist him in entering her chamber by the window; may procure for him her portrait*, et ire ad concubinam, et ei dicere: herus meus te vocat, et eam ad domum heri comitari, et januam aperire et eis lectum sternere non tamen potest eam invitare ad actum ipsum inhonestum cum hero."

* Famulus potest jussu heri videre quo femina aliqua est, et ubi habitet, eique munuscula deferre, herum que comitari ad domum concubinæ, sive causa honoris, sive deffensionis heri, et ei pedem sustinere ad ingrediendum per fenestram domum concubinæ, et ei picturam concubinæ emere.

"A *son*," this Jesuit adds, "may do the same for his *father*, in obedience to his commands; particularly if he apprehend that by refusing he should incur his father's displeasure. And that which a servant or a son may do, in respect to such practices, would, of course, be lawful for persons in any other relation or capacity."

He does not venture openly to assert that a daughter might do the same for her father or her mother, or a wife for her husband, but all this is obviously implied. "It is lawful," says he, "for any other person to do the same, if he hope to gain something considerable by it; and more especially if by such means he be likely to avoid some great loss, or escape anything that would be particularly hurtful to himself."*

Sanchez, more eager than all the other casuists to obtain the glory of defending and promoting every sort of impurity, has unequivocally decided that "it is allowable to lend money, or even a chamber, for the purpose of sinning with women, when neither can be refused without a *great loss to one's self*, which

* Et eadem omnia potest filius ad mandatum patris, præsertim si ex omissione indignationem patris timeat. Et eadem omnia quæ possunt famulus et filius, etiam potest quilibet alius titulo alicujus considerabilis utilitatis sibi accrescentis, et multo melius titulo vitandi aliquod grave incommodum aut damnum.—*Gasp. Hurt., apud Dian.*, part. 5, p. 435, *in add. atque emend. in* part 5; *Resp. Mor., in* ty. 7, *de Leand.*

would be *equal to the evil of the sin to be committed.*"* Supposing you lend your money, or your chamber, without an expectation of profit, Sanchez would not approve of it; because, in that case, the virtue of the loan would not of itself be equal to the adulterer's criminality. Hence this Jesuit has only to produce a pair of scales of sufficient strength to weigh all the mortal sins that may be committed in the said chamber, and to ascertain their precise weight, in order to learn what would be the just proportion in the weight of money to be received for the use of the chamber.

What a lesson does the philosopher Seneca read us in treating on this subject. "Let us," says he, "strive to render ourselves useful and pleasing to others; but let us take care that our manner of doing it be such that as time advances both the service and the pleasure may become increasingly agreeable to the persons who receive them. For myself," he adds, "I will never give my money to a man who I am persuaded intends to make it the hire of an adulteress, lest I should participate in the guilt of his shameful practices. Or if I had already given it, I would, if possible, recall it; that he might never

* Undecimo deducitur licere alicui dare mutuo numos alteri, aut cubiculum accommodare petenti ad fornicandum, quando absque gravi detrimento proprio proportionato denegare nequit.—*Sanch. Op. Mor.*, lib. 1, c. 7, n. 31.

reproach me with having facilitated his commission of crimes, or be able to say, *my friend has ruined me by his kindness.*"*

ON THE VANITY OF WOMEN, AND THEIR LOVE OF FINERY.

Of all the faults of the female character none is more common than an excessive fondness for dress, and a wish to be admired. These, by the confession of females themselves, constitute their predominant passion. What shall we say of Christian priests, styling themselves "*the salt of the earth,*" who encourage in the sex a spirit ruinous to themselves, and causing them to be the instruments of corrupting and ruining others? This the Jesuits do.

"A woman may be permitted to hide any bodily deformity by means of the ornaments of dress," says the Father Immanuel Sa; "and supposing she adorn her person purely out of vanity, or from a wish to appear beautiful, not being so in reality, she commits no mortal sin in doing so." "The *same liberty,*" he adds, "may be granted even to a Nun, provided she be moderate in her expenses;" that is, do not dis-

* Senec. *De Benef.*, l. 2, tom. 1, p. 630.

pose of the money in dress which she ought to give to the poor*.

To the doctrine of Immanuel Sa, just cited, we will add that of Escobar. "Supposing a woman to be excited by no bad motive to dress extravagantly, but doing it from a natural inclination to appear fine, she commits only a venial sin, and in some cases no sin at all."†

"A female," remarks the Jesuit Lesseau, "commits no mortal sin in placing herself within the view of young men who, she well knows, will gaze upon her with lascivious eyes, admitting she has any reason of necessity or utility for doing so, or that she only wishes to enjoy the common liberty of going in and out of her own house, or standing at the door or window, &c."‡ "Neither do women sin mortally in decking themselves with superfluous ornaments; in using habits so thin as to expose their bosoms, or even leaving their bosoms entirely bare, if they do

* Ornari potest femina ad tegendam turpitudinem, quod si fiat ad vanitatem, ad fingendam pulchritudinem, mortale non est, etiam in Religiosa, si moderate se ornet.—*Sa, Word Orn.*, n. 1, p. 486.

† Ornatus corporis si fiat non malo fine, sed ob naturalem fastus inclinationem, veniale tantum erit, aut aliquando nullum.—*Escob.*, tr. 1, ex. 8, c. 1, p. 181, n. 5.

‡ Mortaliter non peccant mulieres, quæ se præbent conspiciendas adolescentibus, a quibus se credunt turpiter concupiscendas, si hoc faciant aliqua necessitate, aut utilitate, aut ne se privent sua libertate, vel jure exeundi domo, vel standi ad ostium vel fenestram domus.—*Lesseau*, Professor in cases of Conscience, in his Sheets on the Decal., dictated at Amiens, art. 4.

these things in conformity to the custom of the country, and not from any evil intention."*

The Jesuit, Father Stoz, says that "A female commits no mortal sin in using paint, perfume, or needless ornaments, from the sole motive of a little vain glory, and for the gratification of a wish to appear handsome, though at the same time she be persuaded that many of the other sex, seeing her thus adorned and embellished, will conceive a violent love for her."†

The last specimen I shall give is better adapted to the taste of the present day.

"Young people have always considered themselves at liberty to be gay and fine." (Thus the gallant Jesuit, Le Moine, addresses our young ladies.) "Every day, nature beautifies the young sunflower with new tints; youth should therefore," he adds, "be allowed to adorn themselves at an age which may be called the verdure and bloom of their days—the morning and spring of their lives."‡ In another place he observes, "It is to the stars only that it is becoming to be always in company, and constantly at the ball, because they only possess the charms of perpetual youth."§

* See the *Factum* of the clergy of Amiens, July 5, 1685.

† In his *Trib. de la Penit.*, l. 1, part 3, ques. 7, art. 3, parag. 3, n. 312, p. 228, col. 2.

‡ *Easy Devotion*, p. 163. § *Ibid.*, p. 127.

ON GLUTTONY AND DRUNKENNESS.

We have now to add the sentiments of the Jesuits relative to excess in eating and drinking, to complete the doctrine of concupiscence.

And let it not be supposed that they are going to urge the necessity of being frugal, temperate, and sober. No, no; according to their morality it is right that Bacchus and Venus should wed. Those virtues would confine sensuality within a circle by far too narrow. No abstinence, no restraint, say these amiable fathers. Eat and drink as much as you can, there is no harm in a man's gratifying his appetite and taste. For this we have the authority of Escobar, in the following words: "Is it," he asks, "*sinful*, for a person to eat and drink as much as he can?" Then, *in his usual bold and imperative* strain, he replies, "*No;* I assert, as Sanchius" *my colleague* "has done, that there is nothing sinful in such conduct, provided it be not hurtful to the individual's health."*

This is a decision which must certainly have been produced in the midst of flagons and glasses; and while I contemplate it, I cannot forbear exclaiming

* An comedere et bibere usque ad satietatem absque necessitate ob solam voluptatem sit peccatum?

Cum Sanctio respondeo negative, modo non obsit valetudini.—*Escob.*, tr. 2, ex. 2, n. 102, p. 304.

with Horace, "O charming bowls, what mind has not been raised, what tongue has not been rendered eloquent, by the liquor you contain."* Is it, indeed, possible to imagine anything more eloquent and sublime than the maxim just now cited? Hear it again, ye sons of Bacchus, and be careful never to forget it. *No; you will remain perfectly innocent, though you eat and drink till you are ready to burst, without any necessity, and solely for your own pleasure:* you have the vouchers of two noted Jesuits for this. Only take care not to injure your bodily health, for that is of more consequence to these good fathers than your consciences. That you may be prepared to answer the scruples of your own minds, and to silence every rigourist, especially St. Peter and St. Paul, who forbid our indulging in "rioting and drunkenness," "excess of wine, revellings, and banquetings,"† let the words of Escobar be engraven on the memory: "It is right for a man to enjoy the pleasure of gratifying all the cravings of his natural appetite."‡ Thus you may taste the pleasures of sensuality in every form and degree; and *in doing this you will be guilty of no sin, if you have only the prudence not to injure your health.*

Hasten, then, ye Jesuit fathers, to the most distant

* Facundi calices quem non fecere disertum!—*Horace*, epis. 5.
"Is there a wretch whom bumpers have not taught
A flow of words, and loftiness of thought?"—*Francis.*
† Rom. xiii. 13, and 1 Pet. iv. 3. ‡ Escob., tr. 2, ex. 2, n. 102, p. 304.

parts of the globe, and as you go, mounting the rostrum, ask, "*What sin is there in gluttony?*" Then reply, *as taught by your beloved Father Escobar, of happy memory*, that "in itself it is at most only a venial sin, and that a man is at liberty to eat and drink even till he vomit, supposing it be attended with no material inconvenience in respect to his bodily health."* Declare also, on the authority of this same respectable author, that "if a person run into all this excess by premeditated design, and well knowing that sickness and vomiting will be the consequence, still he does not commit a mortal sin."†

The Jesuits make drunkenness to serve as plenary indulgence. Escobar *exempts from sin all the actions* of the intoxicated person while insensible of what he doe even though they may prove injurious to others, and would consequently be sinful if knowingly committed. "We may," says he, "give as an instance the case of blasphemy, the using of infidel expressions, the abjuration of one's religion, or the commission f perjury."‡ In short, it takes away all power

* Quodnam peccatum gula est? Ex genere suo veniale, etiamsi absque utilitate se quis cibo et potu usque ad vomitum ingurgitet, nisi ex ejusmodi vomitione gravia saluti incommoda experiantur.—*Escob.*, tr. 2, ex. 2, c. 8, n. 56, p. 288.

† Mortale non est, imo quamvis advertenter id faciat ac evomat.—*Ibid.*

‡ Ebrietas excusat ab omni peccato in his quæ insana mente fiunt, injuriosa, ac proinde quæ sana quidem mente peccata essent. Item blasphemia, infidelitas, perjurium in ebrio.—*Ibid.*, tr. 2, ex. 1, c. 12, n. 56, p. 285.

to sin while the intoxication continues, though acts of murder, fornication and adultery, incest, or other crimes repugnant to nature, should be actually committed; and this is my reason for calling it a plenary indulgence.

Gobat, the Jesuit, asserts "it is lawful for a person to drink till he has lost his reason, for the sake of *preserving* or recovering his health, or in order to avoid a good beating."* Thus we see that to acquire a state of perfect innocence a man has only in the first place to confess with a good servile fear, then to drink heartily till he has lost his reason, whether for the *preservation* of his health, if it be already good, or to *recover* it, if he be sick; and afterwards to continue his carousals without intermission. Having proceeded thus far he is safe. He may now perpetrate every crime that can be imagined, and yet pass at once from a state of intoxication to the pure joys and happiness of heaven—such, at least, is Jesuit doctrine and morality!

ON THE MURDER OF KINGS.

As the Jesuits neither honoured God nor regarded man, they could not be supposed to be troubled with

* Gobat, in his *Œuvres Morales*, tom. 3, tr. 5, chap. 18, sect. 1, n. 9.

many scruples as to taking the life of a sovereign who interfered with their plans or who was opposed to their creed.

"I do not believe," says the Jesuit Father Mariana, "that a man, who to satisfy the views of the public should undertake to murder a king, would commit the least sin in the world."*

To reconcile princes to a doctrine so much calculated to excite their alarm, the Jesuits say, that recourse ought never to be had to such a measure "till the most grave and eminent authors have been consulted." And who are these authors?—"the Jesuits."† Thus these Jesuit fathers make themselves at once the confidants of princes and the arbiters of their death. They manage their consciences according to their own pleasure; and if they think proper to dispose of their lives under pretence that their conduct is not good, they deliver them over to popular fury.

We may here observe, that the Jesuit Father

* Qui votis publicis favens, eum perimere tentaverit, haud quaquam inique eum fecisse existimabo.—In his well-known work entitled, *De Rege et Regis Institutione*, a book, which, in the year 1610, was condemned by the Parliament of Paris to be *burnt* by the *common hangman*, in consequence of the execrable blasphemies it contained against Henry III., King of France. These are the terms employed in the sentence of the Parliament.

† Principibus nihil periculi imminent, quando totius populi sensu pro tyrannis habentur, si populus sequatur doctorum et gravium virorum, quod Mariana exigit, consilium, *Iique sint Jesuitæ*.—This quotation is from *Lessius*.

Guignard was hung in La Place de Greve, for having, according to his own confession, "*unhappily, wickedly*, and *against the truth*, written, that the late king" (Henry the Third) "had been justly assassinated by James Clement, and that if the present king" (Henry the Fourth) "be not slain in battle, he ought to be put to death." That the Fathers Oldercorn and Garnet met the same fate in England, the one for expressing his approbation of the Gunpowder Plot, and the other for having known of that plot, without divulging it; and both for their pernicious sentiments respecting the authority and lives of sovereigns.

And has not the Order of Jesus openly approved of such doctrines, when we find that Father Jouvenci, so famous for his elegant Latin, in the history he has published of the Society, actually represented these three malefactors as three illustrious Christian martyrs, making heaven itself declare their innocence by numberless signs and miracles*?

To cause monarchs to tremble, and induce them to bow in all things to their will, the Jesuits have not only at different times showed them the sabre of the assassin, but awed them by the power of the Pope; and subjected them to his anathemas in

* See pages 8, 28, 29, 116, 184, 188, 190, and 191, of a book entitled, *A Collection of Pieces relating to the History of the Society of Jesus: written by Father Joseph Jouvenci, Jesuit.*

case of their becoming schismatics or heretics. "If the princes of the royal blood become heretics," says Vasquez, "then hath the kingdom a right to elect a new king, and all those princes to whom the succession would otherwise have belonged, may justly be deprived of the kingdom by the *Pope;* because the good of the faith," (*i. e., the faith of the Jesuits,*) "which it is of the utmost importance to preserve, requires this to be done. But if the kingdom itself," he adds, "be infected, the *Pope,* as *sovereign judge* in matters of the faith, should, in order to secure the welfare of that kingdom, select and nominate a catholic monarch; and, if it be necessary, put him into possession of the throne by *force of arms;* for the benefit of the faith and of religion, demand that the *sovereign head* of the church should *give a king to* a nation in such circumstances; and that if necessity require it, he should, in doing this, *disregard even the constitutional rights of that nation.*"*

Thus it appears, on the supposition of a king

* Quod si omnes de stirpe regia hæretici sint, tunc devolvitur ad regnum nova regis electio. Nam juste a pontifice omnes illi successores regno privari possunt; quia bonum fidei conservandæ, quod majoris momenti est, ita postulat. Quod si etiam regnum infectum esset, pontifex ut supremus judex in causa fidei, assignare posset catholicum regem pro bono totius regni, et ipsum vi armorum si opus esset introducere. Nam bonum fidei et religionis hoc exposcit, ut supremum ecclesiæ caput tali regno de rege provideat; et jura regni si opus fuerit, transgrediatur.—*Vasquez,* in his *Disputations on the Summary of St. Thomas,* tom. ii., disp. 169, ch. 4, page 123, num. 42, 43.

and his family becoming Protestants, that immediately he, and his royal issue, are, *ipso facto*, constituted lepers, who must be driven from the camp; or, to use the language of Suarez, they are to be regarded as *wolves*, which it is the duty of the *sovereign pastor* to *chase* from the fold*. *The subjects* of such a king, Gretser† and Santarel‡ (other Jesuits) teach us, *are no longer bound by their oath of fidelity;* and, in case of their continuing attached to him, the *anathema of excommunication, however illegal*, should, according to Clement XI. and the Society, be denounced by the Pope, *to deter them from fulfilling their duty of allegiance*§, notwithstanding the bishops of the Assembly of 1714 declared this duty to be indispensable.

Such are the precepts and doctrines of the Jesuits! those chosen and well-tried soldiers of the Pope—those main props and stays of the cruelty, the falsehood, and the superstition, which for so many years have made the Romish Church the byword and the reproach of all nations!

* Suarez, *Vindication of the Catholic Faith, in Opposition to the Errors of the English Sect*, lib. iii., ch. 23, n. 13.

† Vide Gretser's book, called *The Heretic Bat*, page 158.

‡ In his *Treatise on Heresy and Schism, and on the Power of the Pope*, ch. 30, 31.

§ Prop. 91.

THE OATH OF SECRECY OF THE JESUITS.

[From Archbishop Usher.]

I, A. B., now in the presence of Almighty God, the blessed Virgin Mary, the blessed Michael the Archangel, the blessed St. John Baptist, the holy apostles St. Peter and St. Paul, and the saints and sacred host of heaven, and to you my ghostly father, do declare from my heart, *without mental reservation*, that his holiness Pope —— is Christ's Vicar-General, and is the true and only head of the Catholic or universal church throughout the earth; and that by the virtue of the keys of binding and loosing given to his holiness by my Saviour Jesus Christ, he hath power to depose heretical kings, princes, states, commonwealths, and governments, *all being illegal without his sacred confirmation*, and that they may safely be destroyed: therefore, to the utmost of my power, I shall and will defend this doctrine, and his holiness's rights and customs, against all usurpers of the heretical (or Protestant) authority whatsoever; especially against the now pretended authority and Church of England, and all adherents, in regard that they and she be usurpal and heretical, opposing the sacred mother church of Rome. I do renounce and disown any allegiance as due to any heretical king, prince, or state, named Protestants, or obedience to any of their inferior magistrates or officers. I do further declare, the doctrine of the Church of England, of the Cal-

vinists, Hugonots, and of other of the name Protestants, to be damnable, and that they themselves are damned, and to be damned, that will not forsake the same. I do further declare, that I will help, assist, and advise all or any of his holiness's agents in any place, wherever I shall be in England, Scotland, and Ireland, or in any other territory or kingdom I shall come to; and do my utmost *to extirpate the heretical Protestants' doctrine*, and to destroy all their pretended powers, regal or otherwise. I do further promise and declare, that notwithstanding *I am dispensed with to assume any religion heretical for the propagating of the mother church's interests*, to keep secret and private all her agents' counsels from time to time, as they entrust me, and not to divulge, directly or indirectly, by word, writing, or circumstance whatsoever; but to execute all that shall be proposed, given in charge, or discovered unto me, by you my ghostly father, or any of this sacred convent. All which, I, A. B., do swear by the blessed Trinity and blessed Sacrament, which I now am to receive, to perform, and on my part to keep inviolably: and do call all the heavenly and glorious host of heaven to witness these my real intentions, to keep this my oath. In testimony hereof, I take this most holy and blessed sacrament of the Eucharist: and witness the same further with my hand and seal, in the face of this holy convent, this — day of —, An. Dom. —

A SHORT NOTICE OF JESUITS' WORKS ON AURICULAR CONFESSION.

THERE is implanted in the heart of man by that great and merciful Creator to whom he owes everything in this life that he enjoys, a knowledge of good and evil. This knowledge was given him to regulate his conduct, and to enable him to perform alike his duty to his God, to his neighbour, and to himself. But this was too simple a creed to suit the tastes of monks and friars, especially the Jesuits, who, professing a revealed religion, substituted in its place a criminal code, designated by the name of Cases of Conscience, or penitential, which they have forced the unlettered laity to submit to, under pain of temporal or eternal punishment. Space will not admit of our going deeply into this subject, upon which volumes might be written. We shall, therefore, content ourselves with citing a few examples of these pernicious works; and, having given our readers the key, they can, if they think proper, prosecute their researches where we have gladly closed the page. The task would be too long did we attempt to portray these facts: it is sufficient to mention a few of these works, especially such as have appeared within the last few years, in which are recorded the most extraordinary cases of conscience and penitential transgressions invented by a worse than insane theology,

for the purpose of subjecting mankind to a shameful and disgusting bondage.

The Jesuit Sanchez, in his infamous work *De Matrimonio*, has unveiled the mysteries of marriage, and perverted them to a degree of shameful turpitude. This work, a true school of debauchery, first printed at Genoa in 1592, and dedicated to the Archbishop of Grenada, was approved of by ecclesiastical censorship, as we find by the licence in these words—"*Legi, perlegi maxima cum voluptate.*" This work of Sanchez has been the fountain-head whence his brethren have drawn those licentious details with which they pollute the seminaries and the minds of those who are appointed to direct consciences.

Albert the Great, sometimes called the "Magician," it seems had forestalled Sanchez, having thoroughly fathomed this indelicate subject in the thirteenth century, as we find by his *Commentary on the Fourth Book of Sentences.* Speaking of conjugal duties, he pleads, as his excuse, the monstrous avowals that must be heard in confession; "*cogentibus monstris quæ in confessione audiuntur.*" Theophilus Raymond, a Jesuit who lived in the middle of the seventeenth century, commends Albert, though he was a Dominican, for having unveiled to the Casuists this kind of turpitude.

Another Casuist, named Jean Benedicti, was the

author of a work printed at Lyons in 1584, under the title of *La Somme des Péchés et la Remise D'iceux dediée à la Sainte Vierge*, a dedication which would not be accepted by the veriest harlot who ever stepped the stones of Paris or of London. Brantome quotes several passages from this work, the source from which Sanchez derived the *saintly* doctrine of which the reader may form an idea by consulting the original. The licentious manœuvres described by this monk, and the picture he gives of them, are of such lubricity, that it is impossible to translate them. The Casuists took pleasure in diving into the most hidden mysteries of religion, assimilating them to the animal functions inherent in human nature, as is proved by a book of Samuel Schrœnius, entitled *Dissertatio Theologica de Sanctificatione Seminis Mariæ Virginis in actu Conceptionis Christi, sive Redemptionis Pretio, contra Figmentum Preservationis in lumbris Adami*, Leptiæ, 1703, in 4to. A work no less scandalous than the preceding ones, and which seems to have been imitated from that of Sanchez, was published by a priest named Sœttler, and reprinted anew by a professor of theology, with the title of *Joannis Gaspari in sextum Decalogi præceptum, &c.; or, Extracts of Universal Moral Theology on the Sixth (7th) Precept of the Decalogue, relatively to the obligations of Married Life and divers points concerning Marriage, by J. C.*

Scttler; with notes and new researches, by J. P. Rousselet, Professor of Theology in the Seminary of Grenoble, 1840. In pages 17, 23, 28, and 37, we find cases of conscience and questions so very disgusting upon such unheard of crimes, that we should feel ashamed to mention them in any language.

Another work, which like the preceding is put into the hands of young seminarists, is not less likely to corrupt their morals than those of the persons who confess to them: it is entitled *Compendium Theologiæ Moralis, &c.; or, Abridgments of Moral Theology, extracted chiefly from the works of B. Ligori, by Moullet, ex-professor of Moral Theology, printed with the permission of the Superiors*, Friburg Labartrori, 2 vols. 8vo., 1834. This work is remarkable for the subtleties of its distinctions and arguments; it authorizes murder, theft, adultury, and other crimes. Here we find it inculcated, that "The agent obeying his chief, with a good intention, acts meritoriously, though by so doing he acts against the law of God: *quamvis materialiter agat contra legem Dei.*" P. 38. It is with maxims like these that the Jesuits have excited the Ravaillacs, the massacre of St. Bartholomew, insurrections, murders, and rebellions without number, those long and fearful civil wars that have desolated from time to time the whole of Europe, and which, from the spirit of tyranny and

intolerance which has ever characterized the Jesuits in all ages, bids fair once more to deluge the world in the blood of Christians.

It is from the same maxims that the oaths by which the executive of a country would bind the priests to obey the laws and civil authority in common with their fellow-subjects, have ever been considered by them as mental restrictions, or as subordinate to the laws of the Church and to the will of the Pope—as really of no value, and imposing no real obligation. "*Ad nihil tenetur ex virtute religionis, cum verum juramentum non emisent: tenetur tamen ex justicia ad præstandum; quod ficte et dolose juravit.*" P. 221.

Next comes the instruction which this Casuist gives to young confessors when abandoned women come to reveal to them, with precise details and circumstances, the acts of shameful debauchery to which they have consented. After having said, that he who by solicitation, address, fraud, or by promises of marriage, corrupts a virgin, is bound to make reparation only in case the thing should be known to the public, this honest Casuist adds: "If, however, his crime has remained absolutely secret, it is more than probable that, in his conscience, the seducer is bound to make no reparation." P. 406.

In vol. ii., p. 383, there is another combination of

infamy, which could only have been imagined by a Jesuit of the same stamp as Sanchez.

The following maxim is worthy of figuring among those which Escobar has already given us for the guidance of confessors. "For a marriage to be valid, there must be an internal mutual consent; for marriage is a legitimate contract that is essentially true of two persons. If, therefore, the consent of either party were feigned or fictitious, the marriage would be void." Vol. ii. p. 216.

It may not be foreign to the purpose to observe here, while speaking on marriage, that there is a doctrine taught by the Romish Church, frightful even to think of, and calculated to overturn all laws human and divine. It aims a fatal blow at the root of the whole social system, shattering to pieces every link which binds man to man, a wife to her husband, or child to its parent. It is—"Married women, who have no children and never had any, are taught by Romish priests that the Church has the power of giving them fecundity, and thus enabling them to comply with the great object of their creation. 'The Holy Catholic Church' in her wisdom and deep knowledge of human nature, knows full well, that married women, especially those who have property, are often unhappy because they have no children; and the priests looking upon this as a seasonable opportunity, not only of making money, but of

indulging their own wicked and voluptuous passions with impunity, tell such women in the confessional, that they have the power specially delegated to them from Almighty God, of giving them those children for which they are so anxious."

Equally destructive of morality is the teaching set forth to confessors in Dens' treatise *De Peccatis*, and Antoine's *Moral Theology*, where the reader, if he turns to them, will find the obscene questions which are daily put by priests and bishops of the Romish Church in the confessional to all women—to the wife, the widow, and the maiden! Why are Roman Catholics so blind and infatuated as not to possess themselves of these books, and judge for themselves whether the confessional, much less the convent, is a fitting place in which to intrust the honour and the happiness of their wives, their daughters, or their sisters!

Another valuable work placed in the hands of the youthful confessor, to enable him to draw out the better the mysteries of the nuptial bed, and the secret thoughts and wishes of the young maiden, virtuous till placed under the training of the priest, is *Institutiones Philosophiæ ad usum Collegiorum et Seminariorum Auctore, J. B. Bouvier, episcopo Cenomanensi*, Paris, Mequinion, junior, 1841, Sexta edit. So indelicate are some of the passages in this work, that never doubting that confessors might be

hurried away into thoughts and acts contrary to their vows by its perusal, and especially by putting to the other sex questions on which depend the validity of matrimony, the author points out to them an infallible means to preserve them from this danger —a prayer to the Virgin Mary.

The last work I shall refer to is a little book printed at Lyons, with the approbation of the Vicar-General, and circulated by the missionaries. It is entitled *Examination of the Conscience, Rule of Life, Remedies against Sin, Abridgment of our Faith;* and is distributed among young people of both sexes at schools.

As to its morality and character, we shall refer the reader to the following extract from the *Constitutionel*, May 2nd, 1825:—"We have looked into this book, and found to our surprise at the ninth page, appropriated to the sixth and ninth Commandments, obscene expressions, impure details, a complete exposé of the most monstrous combinations of licentiousness; in short, a treatise to teach debauchery and corruption; and this at a time when the Jesuits are making such an outcry about religion and morality. The reader may judge of its improper nature, when we say that it is so bad that we cannot, dare not copy it; and we are sure the *Etoile* and *Drapeau Blanc* dare not insert any portion of it in their pages, though it is approved by vicars-general,

and circulated by the missionaries. This book has been printed at various places, and in a short time will be distributed through the whole of France, and our youth will be instructed by a book to which the cases of conscience of Dr. Sanchez were pure. In looking at this gross abuse we must ask why the Procureurs du Roi, so sensible on other occasions, have no power when morality is thus outraged and justice violated? are they not fathers? have they no daughters at boarding schools? and are they content with this mode of insinuating into their minds a knowledge of debauchery, and acquainting them with the nomenclature of a series of vices of which, in ordinary circumstances, women remain ignorant all their lives? Are these magistrates deaf to the wishes of fathers? and must parents not attempt to save the honour of their families and the future honour of their country? Is there not a commission to examine books of devotion? Is it not time to overlook the theatre and examine what is taught at Church, to set 'Tartuffe at liberty and to put the Examen under constraint?'"

Though there are numberless other disgusting and immoral books for the use of Catholics, the reader may judge from these works, which were written for the instruction of priests and confessors, what are the principles of morality, religion, politics, and philo-

sophy of the Jesuits (for all the principal clergy and bishops are now Jesuits, as was openly affirmed by Bouvier, bishop of Mans, the author of the *Institutiones Philosophiæ*), and what are likely to be the probable results of confession and education entrusted to men who publicly preach and inculcate such doctrines.

ON THE PRACTICE, WORKING, AND MORALITY OF AURICULAR CONFESSION.

AURICULAR confession is not of God, but a mere carnal invention to serve the purposes of man. It clearly formed no portion of that Christianity which our Lord and his apostles taught on earth, preserved and handed down to us in the writings of the New Testament, for no traces are to be found of it in its pages, nor was it practised till several centuries *after* the establishment of Christianity. It was first introduced about the ninth, though it was was not considered binding and obligatory till the commencement of the thirteenth century. Had it been, as the Romanists pretend it to be, of divine institution, and considered as such in the early ages of the Church,

it would have been mentioned numberless times in the works of that period handed down to us, as has been the case in the numerous writings which have since appeared. The hold which God wished to have on man was on his gratitude, his love and obedience, for God would reign in all our hearts by love; the Romish Church on the contrary, would reign by fear, by sin, and by ignorance: fear, therefore, is the legitimate hold it would have on man; its object being to make sin tempting and absolution easy. If men were holy, pure, and undefiled before God, there would be no cause for fear, and the Church of Rome with all its Popes, its prelates, and its confessors, must virtually cease to exist. Any one who will take the trouble of referring to the homilies of Saint Chrysostom, Saint Hilary, Saint Augustin, Saint Basil, Tertullian, and Irenæus, the early fathers of the Church, will clearly see that these all deny the power which priests would assume to forgive sins, and that God alone can remit them. Saint Ambrosius says expressly, that men have not the right to remit sins: "Men lend their ministry in the remission of sins, but not as having a right to absolve: they pray, and God pardons—*isti rogant, Divinitas donat.*" St. Amb., lib. ix., c. 18, "De Spiritu Sancto." But what says Irenæus, who lived considerably before the time of the fathers, in lib. ii., c. 17?—"*Nemo potest remittere peccata, nisi solus Deus.*"

Let us add, moreover, to these testimonies, that of a bishop who lived in the sixth century, who thus expresses the prevailing opinion of his time. "It follows that God has made you judge and arbitrator; he has given you intelligence, in order that you may discern by yourself good and evil; that is, what is good and what is sin. He has given you the remedy after baptism, and *has made you your own master to obtain absolution* by yourself, without having recourse to a priest. Being sufficiently enlightened on this subject, correct your errors within yourselves, and wash out your sins by penitence."*

An evident proof that Jesus Christ did not attach to the forgiveness of sins a confession of the kind so craftily devised by the Popes of Rome, is, that he never exacted such an act upon any occasion when he forgave sins. In the Gospel of St. Matthew it is written, "And Jesus seeing their faith said unto the sick of the palsy; Son, be of good cheer; thy sins be forgiven thee."† He required only faith and love towards himself; as we see, again, in the example of the adulteress, to whom he says, addressing those by him, "Her sins, which are many, are forgiven; for she loved much. And he said unto her, Thy sins are forgiven."‡ Are we to think that Jesus Christ, before he pardoned the numerous sins of this woman,

* Laurentius Novarens, *Episcop. Homil. Bib. Patr.*, tom. ii., p. 129.
† Matt. ix. 2. ‡ Luke vii. 47, 48.

made her whisper in his ear all the details of the vices of which she had been guilty; as young Romish priests, who have just left their seminary, now do, not merely with women of the same description, but with those who are far less guilty in God's sight, and can have no need of a confession which puts in peril both body and soul?

Auricular confession! how these words make the blood run cold within one's veins with horror; and then, as the reaction takes place, boil again with anger and indignation. Auricular confession! Great God of Heaven, what dreadful crime and fearful abomination is it in thy sight! For what is this Papal institution—this Romish sacrament—but a system of the most deliberate and wholesale seduction for the destruction of woman's chastity and virtue; a system dangerous at once to the civil and religious liberties of mankind, and the fruitful source and fountain-head of murder, of treason, of adultery, and the destruction of every social tie that can bind man to his country, to his neighbour, and to his God. Poor, blind, infatuated Roman Catholics, why will you not take warning from the past? Turn to the page of history, turn even to your monkish authorities, and see what auricular confession has been in every age. Have you ceased to be men? Are you dead to the common feelings of humanity, that you can imperil the honour, the safety, and the

chastity of your wives, your daughters, or your sisters, by suffering them to attend the confessional? Have the pages of Llorente and the life of Scipio de Ricci been made public and brought before your eyes to no purpose, that you are still content to consign those who ought to be most dear to you to the systematic ruin and seduction of the convent—to the embrace of lecherous monks and priests? If so, may God help you, and open your eyes; for verily you are plunged into such a state of ignorance and superstition that nothing but a miraculous interposition can save you: for eyes have you, yet see not; and ears have you that hear not, neither will you understand. Make one effort, strive to be men, open your Bibles, wherein is written the law of God—pray to God that He may open your eyes, and then judge for yourselves. If, as the priests would tell you, who are ignorant enough to believe them, that the Bible is the "Devil's book," verily of a truth your priests must be more than his angels.

"The woman who goes to confession to a priest," states Hogan, "whether nun or a lay sister, whether married or single, believes that while in the *sacred tribunal* of the confessional, he is divested of his humanity, and acts not as man but God."

"God hears you" (says he), "hears you through me; through me God will answer you."

"But you tremble, you dare not tell this terrible

God your weakness and your childishness; well, *tell it then to your father;* a father has a right to know the secrets of his child: he is an indulgent father who wants to know them to absolve them. He is a sinner like yourself; has he, then, a right to be severe? Come, then, my child, come and tell me what you have not dared to whisper in your mother's ear, tell me; who will ever know?"

* * * * * *

Then it is, amid sobs and sighs from the choking, heaving breast, that the fatal word rises to the lips; it escapes, and she hides her head. Oh, he who heard that has gained an immense advantage, and will keep it! It was heard, remember, not by the wood and dark oak of the confessional, but by ears of flesh and blood.

And this man knows of this poor maiden or young wife what the husband has not known in all the long effusion of his heart by day and night; what even her mother does not know, who thinks she knows her entirely, having had her so many times a naked infant upon her knees!

The day when this mystery was imparted he was very near her; she felt it. On a higher seat, he seemed to have an irresistible influence over her. A magnetic influence had vanquished her; for she wished not to speak, and she spoke in spite of her-

self. She felt herself fascinated, like the bird by the serpent.

And her family now? her husband? who will dare to assert that his position is the same as before?

And the young girl who goes to the confessional, perhaps the inmate of a fashionable boarding school conducted by nuns—what is but too often her fate! seduced by some profligate priest whilst at school; degraded in her own eyes; unfitted, even in her own mind, to become the companion and wife of an honourable man; seeing no alternative but death or dishonour, she retires into a convent, and becomes a nun.

Let us trace back a page in her sad history. Young, lovely, and as yet chaste, she is going to confess; alas! how can she escape. Like as a spider watches a fly as it approaches the very verge of the web where he is laying coiled up in ambush, the priest in his box is awaiting the arrival of the young penitent. She enters, the door is fastened, the shelving-board removed, and her face approaches his; involuntarily she shrinks from him, though as yet unconscious of her danger. The fatal dialogue, the commencement of her systematic seduction, now commences.

Con.—What sins have you committed?

Pen.—(Confused). I do not know of any, sir.

Con.—Do not be frightened, my child. I ask you in order that I may the sooner pardon you; for, even as God, I am more willing to absolve than to punish. Speak.

Pen.—I cannot remember anything, sir. I over-slept myself this morning, and was late at morning service, but it was involuntary.

Con.—Are you sure you did nothing wrong yesterday? Examine yourself well.

Pen.—I threw some ink over mama's dress, and because I was punished for it I was angry and made faces at sister C——.

Con.—(Scarcely able to suppress a smile at finding the girl perfectly innocent.) Have you nothing else to confess? Tell me what made you over-sleep yourself? Did you dream in the night?—the devil often tempts us in our sleep.

Pen.—(Hanging down her head.) I dreamt that

Con.—What, my child? You must conceal nothing from me. What did you dream?

Pen.—(Confused.) That cousin H—— was running after me, and trying to kiss me.

Con.—Have you had any immoral thoughts?

Pen.—I do not understand what you mean, sir. What are they?

Con.—Have you been thinking about men, and

have you suffered them to touch you in an immodest way? I must know all.

Pen.—(Half frightened, and in tears.) Cousin H—— touched my face with his hand one day, but I did not know it was immodest.

Con.—Did you ever wish to ?

Pen.—Oh, no. (Blushing deeply.)

Con.—Did he ever kiss you?

Pen.—Yes, sir; but only once.

Con.—Have you ever thought of him, or of any other person at night?

* * * * * *

In this strain does the reptile confessor proceed, till his now half-gained prey is filled with ideas and thoughts to which she had hitherto been a stranger. He tells her she must come again to-morrow. She accordingly comes; and he gives another twist to the screw which he has now firmly fixed upon the soul and body of his penitent. Day after day, week after week, and month after month, does this hapless innocent child come to confession, until this wretch has worked up her passions to a tension almost snapping, and then becomes his easy prey. We will not attempt to give the details of the whole process by which a Romish confessor debauches his victims in the confessional; but those who may feel any doubt as to the infamous questions asked at the confes-

sional, let them take the trouble of perusing the *Daily Companion*, which is given into the hands of young females, to prepare them for the confessional in England; Dens' treatise, *De Peccatis;* and Antoine's *Moral Theology*. In these books they will find the obscene questions which are put by priests and bishops of the Romish Church to all women, young and old, married and single; and if, after a careful perusal of these questions, any husband, father, or brother, permits his wife, his daughter, or his sister, to go to the confessional, I do not hesitate to tell him he is dead to the common feelings of human nature.

That seduction often takes place in the confessional, let us turn to the Bull of Benedict XIV., entitled, *Sacramentum Penitentiæ*, for a proof:— "The priest who shall attempt to solicit or entice to the commission of dishonourable and base sins, either by words, or signs, or nods, or touch, or by writing, then or afterwards to be read, any penitent, whatever person she may be, either in the act of sacramental confession, or before, or immediately after confession, or by the occasion or pretext of confession, or even without the occasion of confession in the confessional, or in any other place destined or chosen to hear confessions, with the pretence of having confessions there, or who shall have held with presumptuous audacity any unlawful or dishonourable con-

versation or intercourse with them, is ordered to be suspended for ever: and the same Benedict XIV. decrees that priests so soliciting shall be for ever incapacitated of celebrating mass."

Can a doubt rest on the mind of any rational being who peruses this document, that this tribunal which they presume to call holy, that it may observe the consciences of blind and ignorant mortals, is actually a means of perdition in the hands of some confessors, by their own admission—*and of how many, who can tell!*

Are St. Thomas, Dr. Murray, Dr. Doyle, Dr. Keating, and Dr. Kensella, all mistaken, when they say that this sacrament (auricular confession) is a means of sending down persons to hell? Let any Roman Catholic read their bishop's own law here against their own priests. Let them see the evils to which, by the confession of Pope and bishops, their wives, and daughters, and sisters are exposed; and let him ask himself, Is this the religion of the Bible? or have I any right to call myself a Christian, who allow those of whom, as a man, as a parent, as a husband, or as a brother, I ought to be the guardian, to run the risk of such acknowledged temptations and trials as these? If there is no danger of these evils, why such a law to guard against them? But the truth is, these evils have existed, and ever will exist, so long as auricular confession is a sacrament

of the Romish Church. Turn to the pages of Llorente and Scipio de Ricci, which tell us the thousands upon thousands of women who have been seduced and debauched at the confessional.

We may here remark that before auricular confession was established and declared a sacrament by the Council of Lateran, certain penitential interrogatory formulas had been drawn up for the use of confessors, in order to enable them to discover the sins of which they who applied to them might be guilty. But with a view of discovering sins of which in many cases their penitents were ignorant, *they taught them the knowledge of them!*

Thus the knowledge of vice was given to those who were ignorant of it, and an impulse, by which both parties are urged towards that passion to which human nature is so prone—so easily falls the victim.

What other effect could be expected from those unchaste and filthy conversations, which, by vividly exciting the imagination, inspired wishes which might be satisfied the more easily as the enjoyment of them remained unknown to the public?

Indeed, what is easier than to seduce a young woman who is known to be susceptible, or one who, already in mind corrupted, ever seizes the opportunity of satisfying her inclinations? an opportunity which invites still more to crime, as both parties

are certain that nothing will transpire between two guilty persons equally interested in keeping the secret.

The opportunity of seducing a woman, the probability of success, and the attempt which follows, inherent in auricular confession, must happen in a vast number of instances; for, as Llorente observes, "A woman, almost always young and weak, gives, by confession of the faults she has committed against the sixth (seventh) precept of the Decalogue, the most frequent opportunities for the attempt of which the confessor becomes guilty." "Penitents," says Erasmus, "often fall into the hands of priests who, under the pretence of confession, commit acts which are not fit to be mentioned; they who ought to correct morals become the accomplices, the teachers, and disciples of debauchery. Would to God that my warnings were unfounded, and that there did not exist everywhere so many examples of these irregularities of which I speak only in sorrow, and cannot mention without blushing."* The same author observes that confession tends to deprave the morals of young priests by the detailed accounts of obscenities, which excite their curiosity and inflame their passions. They converse of these things with their penitents, which talk leads necessarily to evil. In further confirmation of the dreadful state of morals

* Erasmus, *Exomologia, seu Modus Confitendi*, p. 129.

caused by auricular confession, he states "that he heard a priest, director of a convent of nuns, boast that he had seduced two hundred virgins at the confessional."

"Priests well know," says Dalle, an English theologian, in his work, *De Confessione*, "the shameful compacts that are often the result of the secret conversations which pass in that place of darkness. How desirable would it have been for many women that confession had never been instituted."

"And the priest himself," says Paul Courier, from whom we quote, "must he not be something more than man if he can run the fiery ordeal with impunity? What is his life? What is his condition? Love and marriage are forbidden him; yet women are given up to him! He may not have *one*, but he may live familiarly with them all; enjoying the closest intimacy, possessing their full confidence, and masters of the secresy of their private actions, nay, even of their most hidden thoughts! The innocent little girl, under the maternal roof, hears for the first time the priest, who, soon calling her, converses with her apart; he precedes the husband in her affections, and ever stands his ground. What she dare not confide to her mother, or avow to her husband, a priest must know: he demands and knows it, yet will he not be her lover. How can he be? Is he not in holy orders? He hears a young

woman whispering to him her faults, her feelings, her secret wishes and weaknesses; he inhales her sighs without feeling any emotion: and he is five and twenty!"

Confess a woman! Imagine what it is. Quite at the bottom of the church stands a box or dark closet, fixed against the wall on purpose, wherein this priest (and they are almost all young) is waiting in the evening, after vespers, for the young penitent whom he loves. She knows it; love cannot hide from the person loved. Here you will stop me: his character as a priest, his education, his vows. I tell you the vow has nothing to do with it. Every village curate on leaving the seminary, healthy, young and active, loves, beyond all doubt, one of his parishioners. It cannot be otherwise: and if you contest the point I will tell you more—he loves them all, at least those of his own age; but he prefers one, who seems to him, if not handsomer than the others, more modest, more prudent, and whom he would marry; he would make her a virtuous wife, were there no Pope. He sees her every day, meets her at church; and sitting facing her during the long evenings in winter, he imprudently quaffs the poison of her eyes.

Now tell me, when he hears that young girl on the morrow approaching the confessional—when he knows her step, and can say, "there she is!"—what

is passing in the breast of the poor confessor? Honesty, duty, wise resolution, are here of little service, without some especial grace from heaven. She comes to him, and kneels to him—to him whose heart is beating and throbbing. What think you of such a situation? Alone, mostly, without any other witness than those walls and vaulted roofs, they converse of what? Alas! of everything that is not innocent: they speak, or rather whisper, and their mouths are close to each other; they breathe each other's breath. That lasts an hour or more, and is often renewed.

Think not I invent. This scene has taken place, and throughout France, exactly as I have described it: it is renewed every day by forty thousand young priests with as many girls, whom they love, because they are men; whom they confess in this way, converse with *tête à tête*, visit, because they are priests, but do not marry, because the Pope opposes it. The Pope pardons them everything but marriage; and would rather have the priests adulterers, unchaste, debauched, even assassins, than married. Witness the holy horror of Pius IX., the present Pope, on this subject. "To this point," writes he, "tends that *infamous conspiracy* against the sacred *celibacy of the clergy*, which, oh! shame, has been encouraged even by some ecclesiastics, who, miserably forgetful of their proper dignity, have suffered themselves to be

overcome and drawn aside by the seductions and blandishments of illicit pleasure;"* for thus the Holy Father is pleased to term the honourable estate of marriage, under the teaching of his lords and masters, the Society of Jesus.

What was the doctrine that the Jesuit Molina taught—revived again now in this century? Is it not dreadful to contemplate, lulling all spiritual apprehension, and exciting into activity the carnal passions of female devotees?

"A woman," says Molina, "must not when she sins be uneasy about it; for should she be grieved at it, it would be a sign that she still possessed a leaven of pride. It is the devil who, to hinder us in our spiritual path, makes us busy with our backslidings. Would it not be foolish for him who runs to stop when he falls and weep like a child, instead of pursuing his course? These falls have the excellent effect of preserving us from pride, which is the greatest fault of all. God makes virtues of our vices; and these being vices by which the devil thought to cast us into the pit, become a ladder to mount to heaven. God, to humble us, permits in certain souls (well enlightened and in their lucid state) that the devil should make them commit certain carnal acts. In this case, and in others, which, without the permission of God, would be guilty,

* See the letter given in the *Ecclesiastical Gazette*, Feb. 1847.

there is no sin, because there is no consent. It may happen that these violent movements which excite to carnal acts may take place in two persons, a man and a woman, at the same moment."*

Susanna, therefore, when visited with so great a fear of disgrace and death, might, according to the teaching of Molina, have regarded herself as entirely passive. She might innocently have abandoned herself to the passion of the elders, provided that, instead of consenting with her heart, she had utterly detested such an act, and held it in execration; for *life and reputation*, according to Jesuit teaching, are of much greater importance to us than chastity; whence it follows that chastity may be lawfully sacrificed for the sake of preserving our reputation. Susanna was, therefore, under no obligation to cry for assistance. She might have said, "I do not consent to this act; I will nevertheless silently submit, that you may not destroy my character, or cause my life to be taken away."† Thus Joseph should have replied when solicited by the wife of Potiphar. And

* Molina's *Guida Spirituale*, Venice, 1684; see also several reprints, Paris.

† Potuisset Susanna in tanto metu infamiæ mortisque, negative se habere, ac permittere se in eorum libidinem, modo interno actu in eam non consensisset, sed eam detestata et execrata fuisset. Quia majus bonum est vita et fama quam pudicitia; unde hanc pro illa exponere licet.....Itaque non tenebatur ipsa exclamare, sed poterat dicere: Non consentio actui, sed patiar et tacebo, ne me infametis et adigatis ad mortem.—*Cornel. a Lapid.*, in cap. xiii. Dan. 22, 23.

thus ought all persons to reply, because the Jesuits, the Holy Society of Jesus, have so decided the point by the mouth of Cornelius à Lapide.

But where shall we find in history that either Jesuit doctrines or morality could be beneficial or even harmless to woman in the confessional? Shall we look to the pages of Scipio de Ricci; to the annals of the Inquisition, where we find twenty-five out of thirty young girls were possessed by devils, that their Jesuit confessor—*restait souven* les nuits entieres dans le couvert pour les exorciser* ? to the celebrated trial of the Jesuit Father Geraud and his penitent, La Cadière, which in 1774 occupied the attention of the whole of Europe? Shall we look to their conduct at Monte Pulciano and Modena in Italy, Montpellier and Marseilles in France; or to their numerous expulsions from every town and country in Christendom?

The confessional, however, is the key by which both Jesuits and other Romish priests unlock the secrets of every bosom *now* as in former times; there they gain their information—the fulcrum of their power—the lever with which they move and direct the operations of families, states, and empires.

* "Il est difficile," says Llorente, "de se faire une juste idéa de ce qui dut passer au milieu d'une communanté de femmes enfermées dans une seule maison, avec vingt-cinq démons en possession de leurs corps; et il y aurait peut être de l'indecence à soulever le voile qui couvre la vérité."—*Hist. de l'Inquisition.*

The necessity of attending at confession is early instilled by them into the infant mind, and where the system is fully in force, is followed by that blind veneration which superstition engenders where she has gained a strong hold upon her victims. In the confessional the power of the priest is absolute; the obedience of the penitent unlimited. The priest presides *in the place of the Deity**. His victim kneels before him in the most abject servility. This is one chief stronghold of the Romish priesthood over their flocks.

We flatter ourselves that we have thrown some little light upon the works used on the Continent for the purpose of the confessional. Let us now say a word or two upon those immoral and disgusting works used at Maynooth for the purpose of debauching penitents—books too, shame and disgrace it is to say, purchased by a government grant from a Protestant country. Take the following for a specimen from *Tractatus de Præceptis Decalogi.*

" If the penitent be a girl . . Whether she has spoken, or read, or sung anything immodest? Whether she is not attached to somebody with a more peculiar affection? Whether she has not permitted him to take some liberty with her? Whether she has not allowed herself to be

* Dens' *Theology*, and other works used at Maynooth College.

kissed? . . . But if occasion should be required the confessor will fulfil his duty."*

"The priest†, either himself in the tribunal of penance, or at least by means of some pious matron (and this will sometimes be a more prudent plan), ought to instruct married women what they are to observe in this respect. And since women not unfrequently conceal offences with reference to this in the sacrament of penitence through modesty or ignorance, it is expedient sometimes to interrogate them on the *subject*: for example—it may be asked whether there have been any disagreements between her and her husband? What were the effects of them? *e. g.* Inquiri potest an dissidia, fuerint inter eam et conjugem, quæ eorum causæ, qui effectus, an propterea marito denegavent quod ex conjugii legibus ei debetur?" Of the other subjects I was about to allude to, let the titles speak for themselves—such as *De Peccatis Luxuriæ Consummatæ Naturalis; De Fornicatione; De Stupro; De Raptu; De Adulterio; De Sacrilegio; De Peccatis Luxuriæ Consummatæ contra Naturam; De Peccatis Luxuriæ non Consummatæ; De Matrimonii Fine; Obligatio Servandæ Fidei Conjugalis;* &c., &c.

Who does not at once perceive, that the very fact

* *Tractatus de Præceptis Decalogi.*

† *Tractatus de Matrimonio*, p. 265, 6th edit.

of making vices such as these the matter of investigation, the subject of close and intimate conversation, must have an effect the most prejudicial upon the morals of society? Into how many a mind has the first idea of some dreadful sin been suggested at the confessional! In how many instances must this have the effect of contaminating minds that till then were pure, and of leading on to yet greater profligacy those whose vicious propensities were at best but partially developed!

Many other wicked and immoral subjects are there treated of in the books used in the training of Catholics at Maynooth College, which, though they would come within the category of Auricular Confession, space will not admit of our giving any minute account of them.

Sufficient it is to say, that Maynooth College, as well as the Seminary at Clongowes, are under the direction of Jesuits. If the reader doubts this, let him read the evidence of the Rev. J. W. Dixon, who was himself educated at Maynooth, when examined before the House of Commons.

"I am afraid," says he, "that Dr. Murray and the rest of the bishops *are too intimately connected with the Jesuits in Ireland, not to go as far as those Jesuits have gone in former times;* because at the time I was at Maynooth, the head of the Clongowes establishment, Dr. Kenney, was vice-president; and this in-

duces me to think that there is *a close connection between the Jesuits and the Roman Catholic clergy in Ireland.*"*

We shall now refer our readers to some of the works used at Maynooth College for the instruction of Catholics, and ask them whether they do not think it a disgrace and an insult to religion that the money of Protestants should be devoted to teach such abominations as we find in their class-books. Vide Bailly's *Moral Theology*, which contains the treatise concerning the precepts of the Decalogue—*On Theft*, chap. vii., p. 232. See also the same author, vol. ii. p. 117, *On the Causes which take away the Obligation of an Oath;* on which it will be observed that some causes prevent an oath from imposing any obligation; so that though a person takes an oath, yet he never was bound to keep it." Compare all the passages of Bailly, and the other authors used at Maynooth, on the means of evading an oath, with the teaching of Romanists in former days. What says St. Isidor of Seville:—"Quacunque arte verborum quisque juret, Deus tamen qui conscientiæ testis est, ita hoc accepit, sicut ille cui juratur, intelligit. Dupliciter autem reus fit qui et nomen Dei in vanum assumit et proximum dolo capit."

* Mr. Kenney was one of the Jesuits at Stoneyhurst, who went to Palermo in 1808, and was acknowledged as a member of the Sicilian body. On his return to Ireland, he was made Vice-President of Maynooth, Nov. 11, 1812.

Let us now see how the Council of Trosly, held at the commencement of the tenth century, regards the sanctity of an oath or promise.

"Omne mendacii genus summopere fuge: omne enim quod à veritate discordat, iniquitas est. Esto in verbo verax: Non aliud dicas, et aliud animo teneas. Nos autem fugientes à Patre mendacii, curramus ad Patrem veritatis, et loquamur veritatem ex corde et ore cum proximis nostris ut mereamur participes in veniri veritatis æternæ."—Tom. ix., *Concil. Labb.*

But how different to this is the teaching with regard to oaths by the authors used at Maynooth. Indeed the whole of Bailly's work is full of the most awful sophistry. See also *Antoine*, vol. iii., p. 79; Reiffenstuel, *De Jure Jurando*, lib. ii., decretal, tit. 24.—In the 5th book, tit. 7, "servants and others are freed from any private obligation due to a heretic." See also Thomas Aquinas, quest. xi., art. 3, *On Heretics*, and Collet in his *Treatise on the Decalogue.*

On the subject of putting heretics to death, consult Cornelius à Lapide *passim*, Maldonatus, Bellarmine, and Cabassutius (the last is the Maynooth class book of canon law), and last, but not least in horrors, *Reiffenstuel*, vol. 5th, p. 203, lib. 5, *Decretals*, tit. vii.

With further extracts upon these points it were needless to load the pages of this book. Sufficient we hope has been said to arouse the mind of every man alive to the importance of education—to the blessings which flow from it if conducted on a virtuous and religious basis, and the evils that must be produced by the continuance of such a system of false teaching as that pursued by the Jesuits and the College of the Propaganda, who have the direction, and exercise sovereign power over the students at Maynooth. How long will Englishmen tolerate such a state of things?

What education and auricular confession is likely to produce when intrusted directly or indirectly to Jesuits, we have endeavoured to show throughout this little volume.

Of their doctrines, their morals, their political and religious opinions, sustained by poison, by the poignard, by falsehood, and by rebellion, which drew upon them the curses of both nations and their rulers, we may fairly judge from the following table of places from which the Jesuits were banished for their crimes.

From Saragossa in	1555
From La Valentine in	1556
From Vienne in	1568

From Avignon in 1570
From Antwerp, from Segovia, and from Portugal in 1578
From England in 1579, 1581, and 1586
From Japan in 1587
From Hungary and Transylvania in . . 1588
From Bordeaux in 1589
From the whole of France in 1594
From Holland in 1596
From the city of Tournon in 1597
From Béarn in 1597
From England, de nouveau, in . . . 1601
From England again in 1604
From Dantzick and Thorn in 1606
From Venice in 1606 and 1612
From the kingdom of Amura in Japan, in . 1613
From Bohemia in 1618
From Moravia in 1619
From Naples and the Netherlands in . . 1622
From China and India in 1622
From Malta in 1634
From Russia in 1723–1776
From Russia again in 1817
From Saxony in 1729
From Portugal in 1759
From Spain, 2nd April 1767
From the Two Sicilies, 3rd Nov. . . . 1767
From the Duchy of Parma, 8th Feb. . . 1768

From the Island of Malta, again 22nd April . 1768
From Rome and from all Christendom in . 1773

Truly was it observed by Bishop Jean de Palafox in his letter to Innocent X. in 1649: "The Jesuits serve governments and the Church, when the Church and governments are submissive to them; but if the Church and government do not do all they wish, they become their most cruel and dangerous enemies."

G. Woodfall and Son, Printers, Angel Court, Skinner Street, London.

In 2 *vols.*, *small* 8*vo.*, *price* 10*s.*,

THE MAGICIAN PRIEST OF AVIGNON; or, Popery in the Thirteenth Century. A History of the Life and Times of Louis the Eighth. By T. H. Usborne, Esq., Author of "A New Guide to the Levant, Syria, &c.;" "Tales of the Braganza;" "Scenes and Sketches," &c.

Partridge and Oakey, Paternoster Row; and 70, Edgware Road (Hanbury and Co., Agents).

OPINIONS OF THE PRESS.

Bell's Weekly Messenger, Feb. 24, 1851.

"Hitherto we have had nothing, comparatively speaking, but a glosing of the principles of Rome and a painting of the blackamoor white, the colours of which have been so attractive to weak intellects as to conceal the dark hues that lie hidden under the superincumbent daubing of paint and whitewash and tinsel decoration. It is but just that these coverings should be stripped off; and in the instance before us this has been most effectually accomplished. Here we have a true portrait of the cruelty, the ambition, and the falsehood of that church against whom the blood of saints and martyrs will cry out till the judgment day, when she will receive her doom double for her iniquities.

We do hope that this book may have the effect which it is so well calculated to produce. If it fail, it is not because it will be said by interested parties to be unworthy of credit, but because our fancied security will not allow us to act as energetically and determinately as the present crisis demands."

LITERARY GAZETTE, MARCH 1, 1851.

"It appears to be completely a *livre de circonstance*, by which, in the times of an old and long-past stand against papal Rome, we may view much that many will think the analogue of present tendencies. It gives much that is interesting about the characters of the period—Blanche of Castile, Albertus Magnus, John of Paris; avoiding the improbabilities of romance by the familiar acquaintance of the author with the history of the period."

EXPRESS, MARCH 22, 1851.

"Under the above title we find two volumes of condensed history of the reign of Louis VIII. It gives a string of facts, set with some art to tell against the Papists: a series of charges which are terrible as they are undeniable. Mr. Usborne's volumes are the legitimate production of an earnest Protestant, and at the present time we may add, that his work may command public attention, as detailing a series of facts which arose in the days of old out of the constitution of the Papal authority."

BRITANNIA, MARCH 1, 1851.

"A work of ability and interest, depicting the unchanged and unchangeable nature of Papal power, and therefore most instructive to us at this crisis of our religious faith and practice, when yet Rome again has shown herself the same as in the days of her unbounded power.

"Mr. Usborne shows us Rome in action many centuries after her assumption of universal dominion —concluding the crusade against the Albigenses, so mercilessly commenced some years before by Simon Montford, the 'butcher knight.'

"Mr. Usborne has succeeded in founding on these facts and men a work of considerable interest and much instruction. The author has most successfully shown that he is intimately acquainted with the times of which he writes. He essays an historical work, not after the fashion of those who use the names of well-known characters without a due regard to the probable springs of action and the accidents of their daily life, but after a deep and accurate study of the inner life, habits, and tone of thought of the age in which the scenes of his work are laid."

TAIT'S EDINBURGH MAGAZINE, MARCH 1, 1851.

"We must do the author the justice to say that he is far superior in taste and attainments to most of his brethren of the pen who have ventured on this

debateable ground. He attacks Dominicans, Inquisition, and meddling legates, with a zeal we cannot and do not object to; but his knowledge of history and the human heart happily prevent him from falling into the error common to zealots of indiscriminately attacking the lives and characters of all those who are on the adverse side.

"The author knows the time and the country of his subject very thoroughly, and occasionally startles us by strikingly brilliant displays of graphic power."

UNITED SERVICE GAZETTE, MARCH 22, 1851.

"Mr. Usborne is favourably known to the public by his works on the Levant, Syria, Portugal, &c., derived from personal experience in the course of extensive travel. He has always been remarkable for a terse and agreeable style, strong convictions, and an aptitude for applying all his knowledge to passing events. In the book before us he has eclipsed all his previous efforts. The subject chosen is at all times one of deep and thrilling interest; at the present moment it has a marked significance. He, indeed, claims for his work the respect due to historical facts. An air of earnestness pervades every page, which treats of the enormities of Romanism in the thirteenth century."

THE PAPACY.

Just published, in neat Case, price 1*s*.

SAINTE IMPUDENTIA;

OR, A

Pylgrymage to Westmynster.

CONTAYNYNGE

THE WONDERFUL HISTORY OF A POPE, A CARDYNAL, A LYON, AND A BULL.

Price 6*d*.

A MISSILE FOR PAPISTS;

OR, A

FEW REMARKS ON THE PAPACY:

BY

THE GHOST OF HARRY THE EIGHTH'S FOOL.

London:

PARTRIDGE AND OAKEY, PATERNOSTER ROW;

AND 70, EDGWARE ROAD (HANBURY AND CO., AGENTS);

AND ALL BOOKSELLERS.

Post 8vo. cloth, 3*s*. 6*d*.

The Witch; or a Picture of the Court of Rome. From the Spanish.

Second thousand, cloth, 1*s*. 6*d*., paper 1*s*.

Five Years a Roman Catholic; with Incidents of Foreign Convent Life. By Miss E. Smith.

In two vols. 8vo. cloth, 10*s*.

History of the Church and Court of Rome. By the Rev. H. C. O'Donnoghue.

With Engravings, 8vo. cloth, 12*s*. 6*d*.

Foxe's Book of Martyrs; with Notes by the Rev. J. Milner, &c.

Fcap. 8vo. cloth, 3*s*.

Puseyism Unmasked; or, the Jesuit Abroad.

Price 6*d*.

An Essay on Popery. By the Rev. I. Cobbin.

Price 6*d*.

The Death Struggle of Popery in Italy. By S. Ferretti.

Price 1*s*. 6*d*.

Popery a System of Priestly Power. By the Rev. J. E. Giles.

PUBLISHED BY PARTRIDGE AND OAKEY.

Price 6*d*.

What is the Pope? By A. Tacchella.

Price 6*d*.

The Rise and Fall of the Papacy. By the Rev. R. Fleming.

Price 6*d*.

The Jesuits of Fact and the Jesuits of Fiction.

Price 2*s*.

Foxe's Protestant Martyrs. Condensed.

8vo. 3*s*. 6*d*.

The Imprisonment and Deliverance of Dr. Achilli, with an Account of his previous History aud Labours. By Sir C. E. Eardley.

Price 6*d*.

The Romanism of Italy. By Sir C. E. Eardley.

Price 6*d*.

The Real Dr. Achilli: a Letter to Dr. Wiseman. By L. H. J. Tonna.

Papal Aggression and Protestant Duty. By the Rev. W. Cooke. 1*d*.

X.

Voices from the Garden; or, the Christian Language of Flowers. 1s.

"We never read a poetical work of the same size richer in sentiment, more fraught with solid thinking, or better adapted to convey sound instruction to the heart."—METHODIST NEW CONNEXION MAG.

XI.

Important Truths in Simple Verse. By the same Author. Second Thousand, 16mo. 1s. 6d.; crimson 2s.

"Some of the compositions are, in our judgment, worthy to rank among the best that ever proceeded from the pen of either of those ingenious and useful writers, Dr. Watts or Jane Taylor."—BAPTIST MAGAZINE.

XII.

Rhymes Worth Remembering. By the same Author. 6d.

"This little work is admirably suited to the tender and youthful mind. It is a moral and spiritual nosegay, beaming with beauty, and exhaling the most refreshing fragrance."—SABBATH SCHOOL PREACHER.

XIII.

Sketches of the Crusades. By G. E. SARGENT, Author of "The Bedfordshire Tinker," &c. Fcap. 8vo, gilt, 3s.

XIV.

The Working Classes; their Moral, Social, and Intellectual Condition; with Practical Suggestions for their Improvement. By G. SIMMONS, Civil Engineer. Fcap. 8vo. cloth, 5s.

LIST OF PARTRIDGE AND OAKEY'S WORKS.

Under the Patronage of Her Most Gracious Majesty the Queen, and H. R. H. Prince Albert.

SABBATH PRIZE ESSAYS BY WORKING MEN.

FIRST PRIZE ESSAY £25.

Heaven's Antidote to the Curse of Labour. By J. A. QUINTON, Printer, Ipswich. With Memoir. Elegantly bound, with Six Engravings on Wood by G. Measom, from designs by Gilbert, 3s. 6d.

SECOND PRIZE ESSAY £15.

The Light of the Week. By J. YOUNGER, Shoemaker, St. Boswell's, Roxburghshire. With Memoir. 3s. similarly bound and illustrated.

THIRD PRIZE ESSAY £10.

The Torch of Time. By D. FARQUHAR, Mechanic, Dundee. With Memoir. 3s. similarly bound, &c.

Sabbath Labour is Seventh-Day Slavery. By J. C. OLLERENSHAW, Working Hatter. 3s. similarly bound, &c. (Hull College Prize.)

Scriptural Views of the Sabbath of God. By the Rev. J. JORDAN, B.A., Vicar of Enstone, Oxon. Fcap. 8vo. 4s.

"One of the best books on the Sabbath question which the controversy has produced."—EDINBURGH WITNESS.